THE ARISTEIDES PROLEGOMENA

MNEMOSYNE
BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

B. A. VAN GRONINGEN, W. J. VERDENIUS, J. H. WASZINK

BIBLIOTHECAE AB ACTIS FUIT FASCICULOSQUE
EDENDOS CURAVIT W. J. VERDENIUS, HOMERUSLAAN 53, ZEIST

SUPPLEMENTUM QUINTUM

F. W. LENZ, The Aristeides Prolegomena

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL 1959

THE ARISTEIDES PROLEGOMENA

BY

FRIEDRICH WALTER LENZ

LUGDUNI BATAVORUM E. J. BRILL 1959

Copyright 1959 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands.
All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any oth means without written permission from the publisher.

Printed in the Netherlands

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF CONTENTS VII

FOREWORD IX

PART ONE

INTRODUCTION I

CHAPTER ONE: The Ὑποθέσεις 4

The Ὑποθέσεις of Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων (H) 4

Analysis of the Ὑποθέσεις of Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων . . . 7

Problems of authorship of H_1 11

Conclusion of P: E 15

Further analysis of H_1 and further comparison between H_1 and H_2 19

Consequences for the critique of the text 20

Comparisan between H_1 and H_2 (continued) 21

CHAPTER TWO: The Manuscripts 26

Introduction 26

Groups of manuscripts: H_1 32

Result 35

Manuscripts of H_2 36

Groups of Manuscripts 37

CHAPTER THREE:

I—The Prolegomena Proper 40

Outline of the problem 40

Contents of P 41

Pal. gr. 29 Vat. gr. 77 42

Previous result: E 44

II—The Biography (B) 44

Manuscripts 45

Consensus of the group **K P a** with other manuscripts 49

Result 52

Title 52

Analysis of B 53

Last sentence of B 63
Beginning of C 66
C presupposes B 68
Parts of C 68
III—The Treatise on the Panathenaicus (Pan.). 72
Pan. 72
IV—The Treatise on Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων (Te.) 79
Beginning of Te. 80
Analysis of Te. 82
Purpose of Te. 85
Text of Plato's works 87
Transition to ὑπόθεσις 87
The ὑπόθεσις 88
Transition from T to E 90
The σφραγίς. 99
V—The Unfinished Treatise on Diction (C^a) 100
Conclusion 106
Addendum. 107

PART TWO

ΤΑ ΠΡΟΛΕΓΟΜΕΝΑ ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΟΥ

Text of the Treatise B(B and C) 110
Text of the Treatise Pan. 120
Text of the Treatise Te.. 126
Text of the Treatise C^a 152
Text of the Hypothesis H_1 156
Text of the Hypothesis H_2. 167
Index. 173

FOREWORD

Avia Pieridum peragro loca nullius ante trita pede
Lucretius IV 1

This book which I submit to the benevolence of readers who are interested in Greek prose in general and in rhetoric in particular has a considerable history behind it. It is in a sense the sequel to another book which I published twenty-five years ago. At that time my study of the Aristeidean problem centered on the ms tradition, history and analysis of the scholia on Aristeides. Now that discussion has become the basis for an inquiry into the structure and the character of a series of ancient treatises which center around the personality and the works of Aristeides. They were composed for the actual purpose of training students of rhetoric and were to serve as a kind of textbook. The conditions in which this type of ancient literature has come down to us are very different from the conditions of other prose works. Adopting a title frequently used in the manuscripts we call those treatises Prolegomena. They have remained virtually unknown. No scholar has as yet taken pains to elucidate their actual meaning, or the problem whether they were composed by one or several authors, nor have scholars entered upon the important questions as to the order in which the ancient redactor wished to present them, or their mutual relationship.

My attempt to restore the ancient scholia on Aristeides and to prepare a new critical edition of them has now reached an advanced stage. It was a natural consequence of my study of the scholia that I felt called upon to pay attention to all the questions raised by the Prolegomena and to seek answers to them. It was a far cry from preliminary facing the problem to taking the first more decided steps towards a solution. I gladly remember several long discussions of the subject with my young colleague Mr. Heinrich Hönigswald of Philadelphia, which extended into late hours of the night. Although we were ultimately unsuccessful at that time in reaching a satisfactory result in view of the seemingly

insurmountable difficulties of the analysis, I profited by these discussions considerably, because they threw light upon some details and enabled me to fix the more general decisive points from which every attempt of analysis had to start. The necessity of laying the critical foundations for the text, the tradition of which is now presented for the very first time, required an interpretation of many crucial passages on which the answer to the main question depends more than ever before. I felt often like Cicero when he searched for the tomb of Archimedes near Syracuse in Sicily and beat his path through thorns and underbrush, but I also felt that I had finally found the Ariadne's thread which might lead me out of the labyrinth. Now I invite the patient reader to follow me on the intricate and twisted path along which I had to go. I hope that the journey will not disappoint him and will give him the impression that at the end of the way a clear result awaits him.

It is a pleasant duty for me to gratefully acknowledge the generous support I received from The Oberlaender Trust and The American Philosophical Society. Without it I should not have been in position to reach this milestone of my work on Aristeides at a time when the fate of the world is at stake. I feel gratefully obliged also to professor George Lincoln Hendrickson of Yale University. He accompanied the progress of my work with warm interest and gave me much helpful advice.

New Haven, Connecticut
January, 1944

Now I wish to express my grateful appreciation to Professor J. H. Waszink of Leiden and to Mr. F. C. Wieder, Director of E. J. Brill's Publishing House for their interest in my manuscript which had been hidden in my desk due to war- and postwar conditions.

Georgetown, Texas
December, 1958

PART ONE

INTRODUCTION

The problem

No systematic inquiry into and analysis of the so called Aristeides Prolegomena has been attempted up to the present time. In his article on Sopater, R. E. s.v. 1004 St. Glöckner refers to a paper of the late professor Bruno Keil in which that problem is said to have been solved. Since Keil's paper has never been published by its present owner Glöckner, the results attained by Keil have remained virtually unknown except for one detail referred to by Glöckner with which we shall have to deal later on. The main reason for not using those remains of ancient research on the sophist and orator Aelius Aristeides for the history of Greek literature and rhetoric is that scholars have not as yet taken pains to lay the foundations for the understanding of the Prolegomena by systematic and close examination of the extant manuscripts. The most recent edition was published more than 100 years ago. In 1829 W. Dindorf presented at the end of the third volume of his edition of Aristeides after the scholia on the discourses a new text of the Prolegomena. This text which hardly deserves to be called a recensio is no original scholarly achievement. It is rather almost completely based upon the results reached by the previous editor of Aristeides S. Jebb (1722-1730). Both scholars made an important mistake in restricting themselves to two manuscripts which were as late as the end of the 14th century, **L** = Barocc. 136 and **N** = Oxon. Colleg. Nov. 259 [1]), the Juntina of 1517, the editor of which Euphrosinus Boninus used manuscripts of very small value [2]), and the Aldine editions which are of no higher authority than the Juntina. This inadequate basis prevented scholars from any further critical work and more comprehensive study of these interesting documents. The first necessary step is, therefore, to set up a more solid basis of greater extent, upon which a new critical text and an analysis as well may be founded.

1) Cf. B. Keil's Praefatio to the second volume of his edition of Aristeides, Berlin 1898, p. XV f.; the second volume is the only one that has ever been published.

2) Cf. Keil, l.c., p. XXXII.

Only by close study of the manuscripts we might also succeed in answering the two important questions as to the author or authors of the treatises on Aristeides and as to their purpose. Immediate answers to these two questions cannot be given; on the contrary the investigation is unusually difficult because no one of the older manuscripts which Keil used for his second volume preserves also the entire collection of the Prolegomena. The extent to which some of them present the Prolegomena and the order in which they present them vary so much that it is quite impossible to rely throughout the Prolegomena upon one manuscript or group of manuscripts only. Even a perfunctory comparison between the various versions in the manuscripts gives the impression that the treatises, probably because they were used by ancient professors of rhetoric for purposes of instruction, went through several stages during which they were changed, transformed, abridged and normalized for general diction and special terminology. This insight proves to be helpful in grouping the manuscripts and makes it easier to differentiate between them. That possibility of forming them into clearly distinguishable groups paves the way for deciding on their value. It goes without saying that the more the text bears witness to the process of change, the farther it must be removed from the original version. Manuscripts of this type do not reproduce the original form of the whole collection of treatises nor do they present the original words of the author or authors. Their value is chiefly negative, inasmuch as they make it sufficiently clear that certain various readings cannot be taken into account when an attempt is made to trace the treatises back to the earliest redaction that can be reached at all, and that they must, therefore, be excluded from the text. On the other hand we must refrain from overestimating that grouping of the manuscripts. However useful it may be for attaining better established conclusions, it does not free us from the necessity of examining each doubtful passage on its own merits.

The second difficulty to be faced is of a more special kind. Since the extent of the Prolegomena in the manuscripts varies surprisingly, as I have said above, we must ask whether or not the whole material offered by the manuscripts is to be included among the

Prolegomena. It will appear very soon that it is quite impossible to acquiesce in the form which the collection received in Dindorf's edition vol. III, pp. 737-757 under the heading "Prolegomena". The main reason for our disagreement is that some of the treatises included in the Prolegomena resemble in content and character the introduction (ὑπόθεσις) to or summary of the oration Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων (III 433-439 Dind.) so strikingly that it seems very hard at first glance to differentiate between them. It becomes, therefore, necessary to enter upon an inquiry into the relationship between the Prolegomena and that hypothesis [1]) — it is surprising that this problem was not even raised by Dindorf—and into the question whether or not the hypothesis must be considered a special part of the Prolegomena.

1) From now on I shall use the abbreviation P for the Prolegomena and H for the ὑπόθεσις.

CHAPTER ONE

THE ΥΠΟΘΕΣΕΙΣ

The hypotheseis of Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων

It is impossible to define the relationship between P and H unless we succeed in answering a preliminary question which is raised by the fact that there exist two versions of H (169-172 and 157-166) which are very far from being close to each other. It is, therefore, necessary to introduce a subdivision. For some reasons that will become evident later on I call the version which is placed first in Dindorf's edition H_2 and the other one H_1. A systematic comparison between H_1 and H_2 will make it clear first that the order in Dindorf's edition in which H_1 has the designation **B** and H_2 the designation **A** means nothing and does not enable us to draw any conclusions concerning the value of the two redactions and the priority of either one, and secondly that only H_1 provides a solid basis for a full understanding of H. H_1 is twice as long as H_2. Do they have nothing in common or is there any relationship between H_1 and H_2? If there is any, is H_2 the result of epitomizing H_1, or is H_1 the product of extending H_2, in both cases with some changes and adjustments in the paragraphs which they have in common? Were those changes made according to some plan? Or, and that is the last possible alternative, do H_1 and H_2 reproduce the same original in two redactions?

If we consult Dindorf's edition, we do not receive an immediate answer to all these fundamental questions; we find, however, a valuable starting point. Dindorf assigns, as I have just said, to H_2 (at the end) the letter **A** and to H_1 the letter **B**. The same letters were used by Dindorf in the text of the scholia throughout. In my book "Untersuchungen zu den Aristeidesscholien" [1]) I have proved that the **B**-scholia [2]) represent the older redaction and that this redaction gives the only available clue to restoring the earliest possible text of the scholia, but that the **A**-scholia [3])

1) *Problemata* 8, Berlin 1934.
2) Dindorf's **B** and **D** are the Monacenses graec. 249 and 123.
3) Dindorf's **A** is a Meermannianus.

are poor representatives of that stage which I have there called the more recent Sopater scholia. Although the **A**-scholia were remodeled after the earlier redaction **B** which, in spite of many transformations, gives a fairly clear impression of Sopater's research on Aristeides and his exegetical activity as professor of rhetoric, they usually change and epitomize, which means in this case deteriorate, the original; in a few cases they increase it by some additions, almost all of which are without any value. The process of changing and supplementing the older scholia probably started late in antiquity, but most of it was done in the Byzantine era. For the details which I need not repeat here [1]) I refer to my book.

If we were free to draw a conclusion of analogy from the relationship between the two redactions of the scholia to H_2 (the first hypothesis in Dindorf's text) and H_1 (the second hypothesis in Dindorf's text), a seemingly simple result could be easily attained: it would appear that H_2 which is represented by Dindorf's **A** must be rejected without further examination. We must, however, not be too prone to give free course to a wrong or at least preposterous conclusion of analogy of this kind, and it is much better not to rely very much upon the designations used by Dindorf, for the simple but important reason that Dindorf knew nothing about the true manuscript tradition of H_1 and H_2. For the manuscripts enable us to make the surprising statement that, against our expectation, it is H_2, not H_1, which is offered by the oldest of all manuscripts

1) I take this opportunity to discuss briefly the scholion III 213, 36-214, 6 Dind. The older scholion (**BD** which must be replaced by **M** = Marc. graec. 423 as I have shown throughout my book mentioned above) has received its correct form in Dindorf's text and reads as follows: Πηνειὸς ποταμὸς Θετταλίας ἔξω τῶν τῆς Ἑλλάδος πυλῶν. The more recent redaction **A** (III 213, 36-214, 2), however, does not content itself with this simple statement but adds that the river is now called (the idea of "now" is implied by the present tense καλεῖται) Salabria(s). The second more recent version **C** agrees with **A** but after informing us of the (Byzantine) name of the river, Salabria(s), it makes one more additional statement referring to another river which was called Peneus too and flowed through Elis. This Peneus is supposed to flow ἐν Μασσαλίᾳ. I think that it is not the scholiast who made this strange mistake but the copyist, and suggest that we correct ἐν Μασσαλίᾳ into ἐν Μεσσηνίᾳ. The Byzantine scholiast fell victim to a confusion between Messenia and Elis.

of Aristeides, the Paris. graec. 2951 (A) which belonged to the library of archbishop Arethas [1]). H_2 must, therefore, be much older than the scholia of very late antiquity or of the Byzantine era which Reiske and Dindorf collected under the designation **A**. I repeat expressly that Dindorf's **A** has nothing in common with the same designation for Arethas' manuscript. [2]) The fact that Arethas, under whose personal supervision the manuscript **A** was completed, chose H_2 to serve as introduction to the discourse Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων, complicates the whole problem much more instead of making it easier. Now I have proved in the fourth chapter of my book mentioned above that although **A** is the oldest manuscript of all we have, it does not present the oldest version of the scholia but presents them in a state of transformation which goes back to the pen of the wilful and capricious, although most intelligent, archbishop. I need not repeat here the many proofs which I have given l.c. It is not surprising that the Arethas scholia exerted a strong influence upon the following centuries. They penetrated, in various manner, a great number of manuscripts, either gaining in them absolute supremacy or trickling through the older, and later on also through the more recent, Sopater scholia and forming a unity with them, which now only critical analysis based upon knowledge of the manuscripts can take to pieces. The same is true of H_2 which was taken over from **A**, either to its full extent or in an epitomized form, into other manuscripts which present it either with or without H_1. I need not list here these manuscripts, a survey of which is given on p. 167. Another matter must, however, be strongly emphasized. In my book I have confirmed Wilamowitz' view that the best and purest version of the older scholia is offered by the manuscript **M** = Marc. graec. 423, but I have also pointed out that, besides **M**, the manuscript **v** = Vat. graec. 76 is absolutely indispensable for restoring

1) See the description in Keil's edition, vol. II, p. VII ff.

2) Unfortunately this coincidence is unavoidable. Any change of the letters chosen by Dindorf and Keil would increase the danger of misunderstandings instead of diminishing it. In order to avoid confusion of any kind, from now on I shall distinguish wherever it will be necessary between **A**, the old manuscript of Arethas (Paris. graec. 2951) and "Dindorf's **A**", the more recent scholia.

the older scholia. It deserves, therefore, full attention that these two main representatives of the older redaction of the scholia belong to those manuscripts which know H_1 exclusively.

Analysis of the Hypotheseis of Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων

The editor of a new critical edition of the scholia and of P as well must ponder on the questions as to how to handle the two redactions H_1 and H_2, and whether or not the rest of the manuscripts besides A is of any value for the text of H_2. An answer to both of these questions, and especially to the first one, can be found only through an analytical comparison between H_1 and H_2. For practical reasons I am not going to compare them from the beginning up to the end but rather enter upon an inquiry into an important passage which is in H_2 almost at the end (171,21 ff.). The corresponding passage in H_1 is at the end of the second third (161,10 ff.).

Since the previous attempts to define the εἶδος of the discourse Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων have not yielded any definite result—the author declares—there remains as last chance that "it (the εἶδος) is ἀντίρρησις as Theon the technographer says". Although these words sound almost as if Theon himself had put the discourse into relation with the rhetorical εἶδος of ἀντίρρησις, we would fall victim to an absurd misconception, should we hold such a view from which the author himself was rather very remote. The bearing of those strange words is hardly intelligible by itself; it can, however, be explained under two presuppositions: the author either expressed himself awkwardly or he excerpted his source so briefly and epitomized the original report on Theon so unreasonably that it is no longer possible to grasp what the reference to Theon means. After the words "as Theon the technographer says" he goes on: ὃ (i.e. τὸ εἶδος) τῶν μὲν προγυμνασμάτων κεχώρισται (i.e. it differs from them), μερικὸν δὲ ῥητορικῆς εἶδος τετύχηκεν. Unless the present perfect τετύχηκεν has the meaning of "has become" or "has developed into", it is used here just in the same way as the present tense and simply means τυγχάνει; may be the author used it because he was still under the influence of the preceding κεχώρισται, in any case, however, this usage is characteristic of the late Greek he

writes. Then it goes on: καὶ τῶν μὲν γενικωτάτων εἰδῶν οὐκ ἔστι, τέλειόν γε μὴν εἶδος καθέστηκεν, εἰ καὶ μέρος ὑπάρχει γενόμενον. That is all he has to say about the discourse as ἀντίρρησις. The chief question is whether or not the statements about the character of the εἶδος ἀντιρρητικὸν belong to the author or to Theon. The vague expression prevents us from deciding in favor of either alternative, and our feeling of uncertainty remains quite the same as shortly before. Then follows, introduced by φασί, a definition which differentiates between ἀντίρρησις and ἀντιγραφή, 4½ lines long, then comes another statement of 3½ lines which is introduced by φασί again indicating that this unspecified source considers the discourse a composition of elements of the πανηγυρικὸν and δικανικὸν εἶδος. The author contents himself with a mere report without informing us of his own opinion and, unexpectedly, leaves off speaking. Since he has previously disagreed (170,8 ff. and 171,13 ff.) with the classification of the discourse as ἐγκώμιον and δικανικὸς λόγος, the last paragraph according to which the discourse contains elements peculiar to the πανηγυρικὸν and δικανικὸν εἶδος looks like a useless repetition. There are no sufficient reasons for making, at the end of the hypothesis, this statement, the appropriate place of which—if there is any at all—would be somewhere after 170,8 ff. or 171,13 ff.

All these questions which are raised by this paragraph of H_2 receive their answer and the feeling of uncertainty vanishes as soon as we turn from H_2 to H_1. After pointing out that τοσαύτη ὑπόθεσις (161,5) cannot belong to the προγυμνάσματα the author raises the question τί οὖν ἄρα καὶ (καὶ is omitted in **M v**) τὸ εἶδος λεκτέον τοῦ λόγου; The answer to this question follows immediately. It is introduced by an emphatic ἀλλά which seems to indicate that it is either his own view or at least very close to it. Then he refers to the technographer Theon who τοῖς κατανοεῖν δυναμένοις τέχνας τοῦτο δεδήλωκεν ἡμῖν. The danger of misinterpreting these words again and of making Theon responsible for an attempt to define the character of the discourse is not so great as in the case of the unclear and awkward parallel expression which is used in H_2. The unmistakable meaning of the words is rather that Theon made it clear for all of us who have any knowledge of rhetoric, and gave us the clue to defining the εἶδος of the discourse by s a y i n g etc.

The participle εἰπών (162,1) which is omitted in H_2 is extremely important because it informs the reader that the following words are quoted from Theon. H_2, however, conceals the fact of quotation completely. I have deliberately not as yet taken into consideration that δεδήλωκεν has a twofold indirect object, τοῖς κατανοεῖν δυναμένοις τέχνας and ἡμῖν: this pronoun furnishes a difficulty which I shall have to discuss below. [1]) But even if we set aside this problem provisionally turning back to the sentence which is introduced by ἀλλά, we feel that the diction of this sentence is much more individual and, so to speak, much more in harmony with the spirit of a professional teacher of rhetoric, inasmuch as the author emphasizes that the εἶδος of the discourse can be defined only under condition that one has acquired the necessary comprehensive knowledge of rhetoric. This view does not appear in H_2. Here the decisive term ἀντίρρησις (171,21) is separated from the quotation from Theon which starts not until 171,22 and is placed before, although it appears from H_1 that the term ἀντίρρησις is an integral part of Theon's words. This change which was made by the author of H_2 had a further consequence. The reference of the relative pronoun ὅπερ (162,1) to εἶδος is unmistakably clear in H_1, that is, however, not equally true of its equivalent (171,22) in H_2. The equivocal form τετύχηκεν in H_2 (172,1) which I have discussed on p. 7. has no parallel in H_1. The discussion of the πολλὰ ἄλλα μερικὰ εἴδη in H_1 (162,4 ff.) [2]) is entirely skipped in H_2. Finally the author of H_1 very carefully informs the reader of the title of Theon's work (161, 12 ἐν τοῖς Προγυμνάσμασιν) and even of the place from which he took the definition of ἀντίρρησις (ἐν τῷ τέλει τῆς Τέχνης), whereas H_2 is quite without interest in details like these. After quoting from Theon the author of H_1 indicates by the brief concluding sentence (162,6) καὶ ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τοῦ εἴδους that he has come to an end and has nothing additional to say about that question, probably because he wishes to show by inference that he accepts Theon's points of view, and is ready to discuss another subject. H_2, however,

1) See p. 13.

2) I cannot enter upon a discussion of the difficult problem how the Greek text is to be established in this passage; cf. also p. 30 and for details see the apparatus criticus.

does not mark as clearly the end of the quotation but adds, with no distinct transition, another definition which is introduced by the words διαφέρειν δέ φασι (172,3). This definition by which he places in contrast ἀντίρρησις and ἀντιγραφή goes back either to the author of H_2 himself or more likely to a different source. He did not take it from Theon because, otherwise, H_1 could not have adopted Theon's characterization of the discourse as ἀντίρρησις. H_2 did not become sufficiently aware that his additional remark on ἀντίρρησις and ἀντιγραφή is incompatible with the preceding attempt to characterize the discourse as ἀντίρρησις and even openly conflicts with it because the ἀντίρρησις is supposed to deal exclusively with living men but the ἀντιγραφή with deceased. In Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων, however, Aristeides defended the deeds of statesmen of past centuries. To remove this objection to the definition he added, without, however, attaining his purpose adequately, the sentence (172,5 f.) πάλιν δὲ λέγουσιν ἕτεροι τὸ αὐτὸ τυγχάνειν ἐν διαφόροις ὀνόμασιν.

The final statement in H_2 concerning the discourse as composition of elements of the panegyric and the judicial εἶδος, which seemed to be introduced with no sufficient reasons (see p. 8), must be compared with the long paragraph in H_1 which follows the discussion of the εἶδος (162,7 ff.). Here the writer proves that it was not Plato's primary intention in composing the Gorgias to criticize the four statesmen. The attacks which he directed against them and the slandering of rhetoric must rather be considered accidental in connection with and following the discussion of the best mode of life (παρασκευή) which makes man better, and of its degeneration. Plato wished to prove that rhetoric is one of those factors which result in degeneration. Aristeides, however, does not agree with Plato's view: 165,11 ff. τὸν λόγον ἐμέρισεν εἰς δύο, εἴς τε πρόσωπον καὶ πρᾶγμα. καὶ εἰς μὲν τὸ πρόσωπον πεποίηκε τὰ ἐγκώμια, εἰς δὲ τὸ πρᾶγμα τοὺς ἀγῶνας. ἀγῶνες means the defense against the charges made by Plato which the author, speaking as it were as Aristeides' mouthpiece, calls δοκοῦντα, i.e. seeming, unfounded charges. The bipartition (ἐμέρισεν εἰς δύο), is not a strict one, it must be modified, according to the author, because ἐγκώμιον and ἀγῶνες are mixed up, οὐδέτερον ἀλλήλων κεχώρισται, in either part

there are also elements of the other so that ἐκ τοῦ πλεονάζοντος εἴληφεν ἑκάτερον τὸ νόημα—he says with some strange revivification of an Anaxagorean tenet adapting it to rhetoric—(166,2 f.). In H_2 this whole discussion is cut down to two brief sentences (172, 6-9). The isolated remark on the twofold or mixed character of the discourse, on its being composed of elements of the πανηγυρικὸν and δικανικὸν εἶδος proves sufficiently that the author of H_2 is acquainted with the detailed parallel discussion in H_1. φασὶ (172,6) does not mean, therefore, that he used any additional source.

The analytic comparison between these two sections of H_1 and H_2 has led to a clear result. It has appeared that H_2 is an epitome of H_1 of very small value, which sometimes is so fragmentary that it cannot be understood unless the corresponding sections of H_1 are used for comparison and as supplement. This small value of H_2 is not counterbalanced by the brief additional remark on ἀντίρρησις and ἀντιγραφή which is missing in H_1. It also appears that Dindorf was not right in placing H_2 before H_1. In so doing he had no clear insight into the relationship between the two redactions of H and apparently he did not wish to disturb the alphabetical order, inasmuch as he took H_2 from a manuscript which he called **A** and H_1 from another manuscript to which he gave the designation **B**. It is a plausible hypothesis that H_2 was compiled for certain actual purposes. It is, however, still an open question whether and how far Arethas, who was the first owner of the old manuscript **A** which contains H_2, and who revised and corrected his manuscript personally and wrote with his own pen many scholia in the margin, is also responsible for compiling H_2 or whether he and his editorial staff selected a mediocre and meagre epitome of H_1 which had been worked out still in antiquity a couple of centuries before Arethas.

Problem of authorship of H_1

This question can be answered only indirectly through a further more detailed analysis of H. The specific contents of the paragraphs discussed above make it necessary to enter upon an inquiry into the problem of authorship. So far as I know, only one attempt has been made to identify the author of H_1. In his unpublished

paper mentioned above (see p. 1), according to St. Glöckner's brief statement, B. Keil came to the following neat result with which Glöckner apparently agrees: "The author of H_1 is the rhetorician Athanasius because the thesis on which the treatise centers that the discourse is an ἀντίρρησις, coincides with the view held by Athanasius according to Schol. III 456,23 Dind." If Keil's reasoning is convincing, the result is of utmost importance not only for H but for P from which H cannot be separated as will appear very soon. Twenty-five years ago in a digression of my previous book p. 120 f. I said summing up the arguments pro et con that Keil's solution of the problem does not eliminate any doubt, but I also emphasized that no decision upon that attribution can be reached unless we take into account even the minutest details that may be relevant for the problem. The first and main question is: how about Schol. III 456, 23 which is the keystone of Keil's arguing? It reads as follows: [1]) 'Αθανάσιός φησιν ὅτι [2]) ὁ ῥήτωρ δείκνυσιν [3]) ἐντεῦθεν ἡμῖν [4]) τὸ εἶδος, τοῦ λόγου ἀντιρρητικὸν [5]) διὰ τὸ κατὰ μέρος ἀνασκευάζειν τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ [6]) Πλάτωνος. Is it probable that the scholiast picked out of the commentary of Athanasius on the discourse 'Υπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων just this one passage and expressed his silent consent by quoting it? The answer to this question must be negative because of the fact that Sopater to whom the main body of the older scholia goes back, wherever he refers to Athanasius, disagrees with him and even makes polemic against him, as I have shown at length in the second chapter of my book following two previous brief references made by W. Frommel and St. Glöckner. It is very noteworthy that the pronoun ἡμῖν in which an undertone

1) The four manuscripts which must be used are **M v** (see p. 6) **R** = Vat. graec. 1298 and **a** = Ambr. A. 175 sup.; smaller variants which do not affect the substantial text of the scholion are not recorded.

2) ὅτι is omitted in **R**.

3) δείκνυσιν **Mv**: δεικνὺς **Ra**.

4) ἡμῖν is omitted in **v**.

5) ἀντιρρητικόν ἐστι **M**: the additional ἐστι which makes no sense and must be eliminated might originate in a duplex lectio which was unsuccessfully combined by the copyist: δείκνυσιν . . τὸ εἶδος τοῦ λόγου ἀντιρρητικὸν and δείκνυσιν . . <ὡς> τὸ εἶδος τοῦ λόγου ἀντιρρητικόν ἐττι, unless ἐστι is due to mere thoughtlessness.

6) ὑπὸ τοῦ **R**.

of personal consent of the scholiast seems to vibrate is omitted in the important manuscript **v**. If **v** is right in omitting it, the assumption that the original scholiast limited himself to making an objective report on Athanasius' definition of the εἶδος becomes much more plausible. It is quite possible that Sopater here as elsewhere, too, in interpreting Aristeides, referred to the view held by his opponent Athanasius. If this holds good, the scholion is no proof that its author had a first hand knowledge of Athanasius' commentary, but goes back to the same source as the rest of the references to Athanasius, that is to say to Sopater's lectures on Aristeides. It will appear that the discussion of P will yield further and much clearer references to these lectures. The fact that the pronoun ἡμῖν which makes the passage more subjective is omitted in **v** becomes still stranger by the similar observation which we have made above (see p. 9). There too we had to wonder if the pronoun ἡμῖν which disturbs the construction and makes it almost awkward is omitted in **M L** (= Laur. 60, 9) **b** (= Pal. graec. 319) with good reasons. We have seen that it is unnecessary in any case. I admit, however, that it is very difficult and perhaps even impossible to come to a clear decision with the help of merely critical considerations and to determine which group of the manuscripts should be relied upon, whether those in which the pronoun is added twice or those which leave it out. It must also be said that, so far as H is concerned, the value of the manuscripts which do not have the pronoun is somewhat problematic, as will appear later on. There is, however, another way that seems to be more promising. Athanasius—the scholiast says—characterized the εἶδος of the discourse as ἀντιρρητικὸν διὰ τὸ κατὰ μέρος ἀνασκευάζειν τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος. It will be very wise to bear this reasoning well in mind. In H_1 161,3 ff. τῶν σοφῶν 'Αθήνησιν [1]) a man is referred to who is introduced as ἀπορήσας. This man is said to have proved that the discourse cannot belong to either one [2]) of the εἴδη—εἴδη meaning the ἐγκωμιαστικὸν and the δικανικὸν εἶδος—and to have emphasized that it must be an ἀνασκευή. The author of H_1 calls,

1) The reference to Athens is omitted in **M**.

2) οὐδετέρου τῶν εἰδῶν δύναται εἶναι must be written instead of οὐδέτερον; cf. in the apparatus criticus the parallels taken from H_1 and H_2.

immediately after these words, this view especially absurd because ἀνασκευή belongs to the προγυμνάσματα, a hypothesis (subject matter) of such an extent (as the question discussed in 'Υπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων), however, can never be included in the προγυμνάσματα. On the other hand the author of H_1 gives to his readers or his audience the urgent advice that they examine very carefully whether or not Theon's definition of the εἶδος of ἀντίρρησις is applicable to the discourse. Now it becomes clear how the characterization of that unnamed man as τῶν σοφῶν τις must be interpreted: it is sheer irony and scorn. His description of the discourse as ἀνασκευή is rejected without restriction and with great harshness (ἀτοπώτατα). Now we know from Schol. III 456, 23 that Athanasius laid strength on the ἀντιρρητικὸν εἶδος of the discourse διὰ τὸ κατὰ μέρος ἀνασκευάζειν τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος, because it refutes from point to point Plato's arguments. The conclusion which must be drawn from this combined interpretation of H_1 and the scholion is beyond any doubt. The "sage" man who set forth such an absurd theory is—Athanasius with whom, as I have already said, Sopater throughout the scholia nowhere agrees. This insight definitively blocks the way to any attempt to connect H_1 with Athanasius (see p. 12) or even to attribute it to him. Emphasizing that the discourse which the "sage" man classifies as ἀνασκευή belongs to the ἀντιρρητικὸν εἶδος he obliterates—the author of H_1 declares—the border line between a discourse (ὑπόθεσις) of such an extent and the much smaller προγυμνάσματα. Athanasius was, however, not the first to consider the εἶδος of ἀντίρρησις in the case of the discourse 'Υπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων. Theon who, in his Progymnasmata, discussed the ἀντιρρητικὸν εἶδος paved the way for this interpretation. Athanasius, however, used this conception in a wrong manner. Theon's description of that εἶδος deserves every appreciation; nowhere in it, however, ἀνασκευή is referred to. Theon was far from putting ἀντίρρησις and ἀνασκευή into relation. It is, therefore, not Athanasius, as St. Glöckner, RE. s.v. Sopatros 1004, 49 ff. thinks, who quotes Theon and agrees with his view but the author of H_1. He criticizes Athanasius not for attempting to apply Theon's definition of ἀντίρρησις to the discourse 'Υπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων but for giving a wrong and inadequate reason for his classification of the discourse.

H_1 enables us also to make a further statement. The words 162, 3-6 καὶ τοῦτο καὶ ἐκ πολλῶν ἄλλων μερικῶν εἰδῶν ἔστι καταμαθεῖν, εἴτε λεκτέον εἴτε βασιλικόν, εἴτε ἐπιθαλάμιον, εἴτε ἐπιτάφιον καὶ ἄλλα πολλά, ὧν ἕκαστα τυγχάνει τῆς ἐγκωμιαστικῆς ἰδέας are either still part of the quotation from Theon or an additional remark which was made by the author of H_1. This alternative is not very relevant and may be dismissed. In any case those words mean an attempt to build some kind of bridge which leads back to the εἴδη of the ἐγκωμιαστικὴ ἰδέα. Then the author of H_1 stops discussing the problem of the εἶδος of the discourse. That this attempt is artificial and even almost violent, did not escape the attention of the rhetorician John of Sicily. [1]) He informs us [2]) that against the κοινὴ δόξα καὶ Πλάτωνος καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους who had recognized three εἴδη of rhetoric Theon and Sopater took pains to establish a τέταρτον εἶδος ῥητορικῆς. Now in attempting to find out to which εἶδος the discourse Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων belongs the author of H_1 comes to the insight that the long established and traditional εἴδη of rhetoric are insufficient and unable to pay justice to such a matchless work as the discourse Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων. Because of the inadequacy of the traditional εἴδη he turns back to Theon's view and criticizes ironically at the same time his favorite opponent Athanasius for being on the wrong track and for having made bad use of a good idea of Theon. I think that also these arguments which are based upon the report of John of Sicily confirm in a desirable manner the result which we have reached by the interpretation of H_1, and that now we may speak with greater confidence. It is Sopater who speaks to us in H_1, either directly or through the medium of one of his pupils who set forth the thoughts of his teacher writing down his introductory lecture on the oration.

Conclusion of P: E

We must not content ourselves with this result of the investiga-

1) A. Boulanger, *Aelius Aristide et la sophistique dans la province d'Asie au IIe siècle de notre ère* (Paris 1923) p. 456, n. 3, is not right in claiming him for the 14th century. From the chronological contribution which H. Rabe made to my paper in the *Herm.* LXVI (1931) 53 f., it appears that the first half of the 11th century is the latest possible time of his floruit.

2) Rhet. Graec. VI 456, 1 Walz = Aphthonius p. 51 Rabe.

tion but, even on this early stage of the inquiry, cast a glance at one section of P though it would be premature to attempt its systematic analysis. In the last paragraph of P, at the end of which Sopater introduces or seems to introduce himself [1]) as author (151,1), the problem of ἀνασκευή is discussed again. The writer calls the interpreters who subsume the discourse under the category of ἀνασκευή crazy (παραπαίοντες). The irony which he used in H_1 (see p. 14) is here replaced by rudeness. At whom this impolite reference which, in accordance with the traditional usage of grammarians and scholiasts, is somewhat softened by the more general plural ἄλλοι, is aimed—there is little doubt about it: it is Athanasius again and no one else. Sopater's determination to defend his view against his opponent appears to have been increased considerably. The blow against Athanasius is continued by a more objective detailed reasoning against the theory of ἀνασκευή. The arguments by which he proves that the discourse has nothing in common with ἀνασκευή are the same ones as in H_1, with the only difference that in P a more complicated rhetorical terminology is applied. The guiding idea is again that a ὑπόθεσις of so great an extent must be carefully distinguished from the προγυμνάσματα. From this comparison between H_1 and the paragraph of P we infer that H_1 was written earlier. During his activity as professor of rhetoric Sopater had more than one opportunity to deliver lectures on Aristeides and to interpret the discourse Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων.

The insight that the section of P with which we deal was written after H_1 is confirmed by another circumstance. We have seen (p. 14 f.) that H_1 argues in support of the thesis that the discourse belongs to the ἀντιρρητικὸν εἶδος but that it does not entirely bar the road which leads back or across to the ἐγκωμιαστικὸν εἶδος. The last words of that argument are καὶ ταῦτα μὲν καὶ περὶ τοῦ εἴδους (162,6). Then comes the comparison with Plato's Gorgias which I have already discussed on p. 10. In the course of this comparison the author makes intense efforts to convince the reader that in Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων elements of the ἐγκωμιαστικὸν εἶδος and the δικανικὸν

1) Cf. the apparatus criticus.—In the text I have deliberately spoken vaguely; the difficult problem of the self-presentation will be discussed at length on p. 99 f.

εἶδος as well are interwoven. Although he evidently felt some concern about the thesis of ἀντίρρησις [1]) which is based upon Theon's ideas, he did not venture to abandon it decidedly. When he composed P, however, he became less hesitating and made it sufficiently clear that, in the meantime, he had found a way which enabled him to free himself from his previous conception of the τέταρτον εἶδος of rhetoric. Now he speaks more distinctly. After refuting the interpretation that the discourse is an ἀνασκευή he adds the brief concluding sentence καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον which resembles its equivalent in H_1 καὶ ταῦτα μὲν καὶ περὶ τοῦ εἴδους (162,6) which I have already quoted above so strikingly that we feel tempted to think that he wishes to recall the previous discussion. In the renewed (cf. p. 16) comparison with Plato's Gorgias which follows he takes a course different from the dialogue without giving any reasons for his deviating from Plato and his own previous treatment of the question. His procedure is, however, not arbitrary, and gradually we learn that his present purpose is different: in H_1 he wished to emphasize the part which Plato's attacks upon the four statesmen play in the dialogue, and to find out why they were placed by Plato not in the beginning but somewhere in the midst. In P, however, he begins his argument with placing first his new thesis: "It remains to be said that the discourse is panegyrical." What he was refraining from when he composed H_1, here he propounds without further hesitation adding "although I have already shown that very briefly". It is necessary—he goes on—that in the three—it appears that he now is giving up the theory of the τέταρτον εἶδος—εἴδη of rhetoric place (τόπος), persons (πρόσωπα) and goal (σκοπός) are described exactly. Place means the court-room in the δικανικὸς λόγος, the city hall in the συμβουλευτικός and the theatre in the πανηγυρικός. The persons are the prosecutor, the adviser, or the panegyrist. The goals are punishment or useful measures (συμφέρον) or the beautiful (καλόν). In applying these

1) A trace of the same view emerges also in Schol. III 439, 26 Dind. in which ἀντιλογία is referred to, cf. my *Untersuchungen zu den Artisteides-scholien*, p. 79. We gain the impression that it took Sopater considerable time until he succeeded in freeing himself to some extent from his former interpretation and in advancing to his modified points of view which he expressed in P.

categories to the question whether or not the four men who were attacked by Plato are real statesmen we must eliminate court and city hall on the one hand, prosecutor and adviser on the other: the speaker does not wish to bring about any punishment nor does he suggest that any useful measures are taken, but Plato rather asks whether or not the four men possessed the four cardinal virtues, the coincidence of which is the indispensable presupposition for a man being regarded as true πολιτικός. Plato denies that the men were endowed with those virtues, Aristeides affirms it. The place [1]) is similar to the theatre and those who take part in the dialogue (or better: the persons of the dialogue: οἱ διαλεγόμενοι) to the audience. The goal is τὸ γεγενῆσθαι καλούς. Thus the parallel between the Gorgias and the specific peculiarities of the three εἴδη of rhetoric is complete, according to the author, and since δικανικὸς and συμβουλευτικὸς λόγος must be excluded in the case of the Gorgias, the πανηγυρικός is the only group that remains. In this comparison, however artificial and almost senseless it be, there is only one passage which furnishes difficulties: it reads as follows: καὶ ὁ μὲν τόπος θεάτρῳ παρέοικεν—this is in complete harmony with the preceding words τόπον μὲν . . . θέατρον—οἱ δὲ διαλεγόμενοι ἀκροαταῖς. These last words make no sense. In the following words, however, the parallelism is evident again: σκοπὸν δὲ . . . καλόν he says in the general statement about the three εἴδη, σκοπὸς δὲ τὸ γεγενῆσθαι καλούς he says applying the general statement to the special case of the Gorgias. How about those strange words between two strictly parallel parts of the argument? What we require and what the parallelism asks for, is easily obtained as soon as we replace the unintelligible noun ἀκροαταῖς by ἐπαινέταις, and I think that is what the author wrote. That means: Plato (through the persons of the dialogue) and Aristeides have similar functions in the dialogue and the oration respectively as the panegyrist in delivering his πανηγυρικός, with the only difference that ἔπαινος is true only in a very much restricted sense, so far as Plato is concerned.[2]) It is easy to explain the origin of this corruption which all the manuscripts have in common. It goes on: Plato speaks in a dialogue,

1) τρόπος in Dindorf's text 757,19 = 150,11 is a misprint.
2) This restriction is expressed by the compound verb παρέοικεν (150,12).

Aristeides does not, Aristeides speaks to *hearers*, not to judges. Thereby it results that the λόγος"πανηγυρικῆς ἐστιν ὑποθέσεως. The author does, perhaps deliberately, not say that the εἶδος of the λόγος is πανηγυρικόν. The word *hearers* (ἀκροαταῖς) occasioned the mistake which is nothing but a slip of the pen of the scribe whose eyes glided down to the other noun. It is significant and deserves full attention for the valuation of the tradition that this corruption appears in all the manuscripts. It must, therefore, have occurred very early before any ramification of the tradition took place.

The analysis of the last paragraph of this section of P enables us to reach, with the help of Plato's Gorgias, a much more unequivocal result than in H_1. From the modern point of view, however, it must be said that in P the author abuses the Gorgias to a degree not much lower than in H_1. In any case, Sopater's more recent view is much more decided and less groping than his previous approach to Aristeides in H_1.

Further analysis of H_1 and further comparison between H_1 and H_2

It is the main task of a further analysis of H_1 and H_2 to emphasize the specific differences between the two redactions. That is especially important because the question as to the relationship between H_2 and the archbishop Arethas (see p. 11) is still open. Let us examine, therefore, the beginnings of H_1 and H_2 and compare the first sentence of either redaction. It reads as follows:

H_1	H_2
Πλάτων ὁ 'Αρίστωνος ἐπισημότατος ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ γενόμενος ἐζήτησε τὸν φιλόσοφον βίον δεῖξαι πάντων καλλίονα πάντας ἐπὶ φιλοσοφίαν [1]) προτρεπόμενος.	Πλάτων ὁ 'Αρίστωνος ἐπισημότατος ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ γενόμενος, τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τέχνην εἰς μέγεθος ἄραι βουλόμενος, τοὺς νέους προτρέπεται, τῇ ῥητορικῇ λοιδορούμενος.

The expression προτρέπειν or προτρέπεσθαι ἐπὶ φιλοσοφίαν was used by the author of H_1 with good reasons because it characterizes Plato's activity appropriately. The active is used by Plato himself

1) φιλοσοφίαν must be preferred to the dative which was adopted by Dindorf; cf. the apparatus criticus.

(Euthyd. 307 a). It is, however, more colorless in H_2 whose author omits ἐπὶ φιλοσοφίαν, but, as a kind of compensation, emphasizes much more Plato's tendency to revile rhetoric. For this addition he pays a high price, inasmuch as the structure of the whole period has suffered considerable loss. The construction in H_1 is well balanced (ἐπιστημότατος .. γενόμενος ἐζήτησε ... δεῖξαι ..... προτρεπόμενος) and shows that the author was able to satisfy the demands of a cultivated prose style. This equilibrium is disturbed in H_2 by an accumulation of participles: ἐπιστημότατος .. γενόμενος, τὴν . τέχνην ... βουλόμενος .. προτρέπεται .. λοιδορούμενος. The author of H_1 is right in saying that it was Plato's intention to point out that the philosophical mode of life is of higher value than all the others. In H_2 this concept is changed in one decisive point: now Plato is supposed to have magnified his τέχνη. It is not only a misapplication of the term τέχνη but very close to what we must call profanation, to characterize Plato's philosophical activity and teaching as τέχνη; it is, however, significant, for it gives desirable confirmation that H_2 was written by a man who spontaneously applied to Plato a term with which he was especially familiar from his own professional activity, however inappropriate this term may be, that is to say H_2 was compiled by a not high ranking rhetorician. If this observation proves true, it enables us to draw a further conclusion: it becomes extremely improbable that H_2 was composed by Arethas or a member of his staff with the help of H_1 to serve as introduction into the discourse in his manuscript. It is unbelievable that the cultivated and learned archbishop, one of Plato's admirers, used the term τέχνη as keyword. H_2 had rather become available a long time before Arethas and his editorial staff began to collect the material for an exegetical edition of Aristeides. H_2 was written in antiquity and represents a perfunctory and thoughtless epitome of H_1 and was compiled after Sopater's model H_1 for being used by less advanced students of rhetoric and, in accordance with this more elementary didactic purpose, is briefer and more popular than its original.

Consequences for the critique of the text

This insight enables the editor of H to handle the epitome H_2

in the correct way. I have already said that H_2 is offered by some other manuscripts in addition to A. If Arethas were the author of H_2, the editor would have to rely upon A exclusively, the rest of the manuscripts would be of no value and negligible. Since Arethas, however, or who else was in charge of the hypothesis took over H_2 into the manuscript from antiquity, the matter is different. There is always the possibility of finding traces of independent tradition in the rest of the manuscripts unless it can be proved that they were either copied from or at least influenced by A. Among them **R** (see p. 12, n. 1) being one of the oldest manuscripts we have —it is a manuscript of the early 11th century [1])—deserves preferential attention. Now it is a matter of fact that the redaction of the scholia in **R** shows then and now unmistakable traces of influence by A. Although **R** is a somewhat undisciplined representative of the older redaction of the scholia [2]), it mixes them up occasionally with the transformed redaction which was worked out by Arethas. The same is, however, not true of **V** (= Marc. app. cl. VIII 7) which has only a few scholia, but all of them of the older redaction and uninfluenced by the transformation which the scholia underwent by Arethas. Nevertheless **V** also presents the beginning—not the complete introduction— of H_2. It is, therefore, necessary that, so far as the text of H_2 is concerned, the variants of A and the other manuscripts as well are examined and used. It would be a methodical mistake to neglect them or to throw them out on principle as unauthorized deviations from the standard text in A. In the present analysis of H I content myself with making these general statements; details will have to be discussed together with the important question whether or not it is possible to establish certain groups among the manuscripts. [3])

Comparison between H_1 and H_2 (continued)

In H_1 and H_2 the introductory sentence which deals with Plato (see p. 19 f.) is supplemented by a statement about the purpose of the dialogue Gorgias. In a process of condensation, H_2 omits less

1) See Keil, *Praefatio* II, p. X.
2) See my *Untersuchungen zu den Aristeidesscholien* p. 48 f.
3) See p. 37 ff.

essential details of this whole statement, for example H_1 157,4 ὁ τῶν τυράννων βίος καὶ ὁ τῶν ῥητόρων$\sim$ H_2 169,4 ὁ τῶν ῥητόρων βίος: the words τῶν τυράννων seemed to be unnecessary because they are repeated two lines after, τῶν ῥητόρων, however, seemed to the rhetorician who compiled H_2 so important that he kept them in both passages. H_1 157,5 f. διάλογον Γοργίαν ἐπικαλούμενον· τοῦτο γὰρ ὄνομα τῷ διαλόγῳ $\sim$ H_2 169,5 f, διάλογον Γοργίαν οὕτω καλούμενον. Plato is said to have directed his first malicious attack against τὴν ῥητορικήν, τουτέστι τὴν τέχνην (H_1 157,8), then against the rhetoricians themselves picking out one of their most prominent representatives and aiming, through that special case, at all of them. H_2 presents the same concept although it condenses it again; it changes, however, a detail of style in a very characteristic manner: Plato's attack is directed against τὴν τέχνην, φημὶ δὴ τὴν ῥητορικήν, then against αὐτοὺς τοὺς ῥήτορας. The juxtaposition ῥητορικήν—ῥήτορας is in H_1 much more pointed and impressive than in H_2. In H_1 the term τέχνην is added as explanatory apposition to ῥητορικήν, whereas H_2, in reversed word order, makes ῥητορικήν an apposition which specifies the more general term τέχνην. The reason for this change of diction is quite clear: the rhetorician, with his small horizon, unable to be directed by higher points of view, wished also in a case of less important details to emphasize the importance of his own profession. There is also another detail of style that deserves attention. Although it is a very little matter it is characteristic enough. In accordance with the well known usage of the writers of the fourth century B.C. H_1 says 157,7 f. πρῶτον μὲν ... εἶθ', but H_2 πρῶτον μὲν ... ἔπειτα δέ. [1]) The more cultivated language of the original has faded away in the epitome. In addition to peculiarities of this kind we find an untimely 'pathos' and directly we witness the little rhetorician schoolteacher who writes and speaks to his pupils with exaggerated affect when no affect is required and a simple word would have a much better effect,

1) It is no proof of independent tradition that δὲ is missing in **K** = Vat. graec. 74 and in Vat. graec. 933 with which here and elsewhere Paris. graec. 2953, a disorderly manuscript and just as unreliable as the two others, agrees. The only conclusion this omission allows is that we find here the traces of the activity of a polisher who was acquainted with the usage of the Attic orators and adapted the passage to it.

and who shows through these exaggerations that his 'pathos' is far from being true and genuine. Sopater whom we must take seriously, or his pupil who wrote down the lecture of his master, says in H_1 157,14 that Aristeides makes a stand πρὸς ταύτην τὴν κατηγορίαν, ἤτοι διαβολήν. H_2, being displeased with this simple statement, replaces διαβολή by λοιδορία and gives as reason that it would not be σεμνὸν to call it simply κατηγορία (169,15 f). Immediately after H_2 gives to Aristeides the epithet θεῖος—the text in Dindorf's edition makes no sense at all—and it is very significant that this epithet is omitted in a group of manuscripts which disliked such an extravagant epithet.[1]) In addition to the adjective θεῖος which apparently did not seem to the author to be impressive enough, H_2 introduces Aristeides as coming to help the imperiled τέχνη, using the λόγοι as weapons and aiding as an ally not so much the rhetoric art as life itself. That is what we call κακοζηλία, and it is almost needless to say that there is no trace of these ridiculous hyperboles in H_1. The poor writer H_2 does not even know Aristeides as thoroughly as he should and as we should expect him to know the discourses. For he goes on to say that Aristeides had defended the τέχνη in two discourses. First the temporal adverb ἤδη is missing, although it is essential because it gives to the sentence its real meaning. It is, therefore, not surprising that H_1 has it in the right place (158,1). Secondly he expresses himself awkwardly saying καὶ δύο μὲν λόγοις τὴν περὶ τῆς τέχνης ἀπολογίαν πεποίηται. Here he must be criticized less severely for using the preposition περὶ in the meaning of ὑπὲρ—he is not the only one in later antiquity to do it—but for doing it just in referring to the first Platonic discourse of Aristeides which is divided in the manuscripts into two[2]) parts. For here he had to refer to its original title which is certified by Aristeides himself (II 5 Dind.). The original words in H_1 show again that Sopater knows the requirements of style, for he says just what we expect him to say: καὶ ἤδη μὲν δύο λόγους 'Υπὲρ[3]) ῥητορικῆς συνέγραψε. That the aorist συνέγραψε is replaced

1) Cf. p. 37.
2) Cf. for the time being Dindorf's note on II 104.
3) The preposition which belongs to the title must be written with capital 'Υ.

in H_2 by the present perfect again (see p. 7 on τετύχηκεν), also deserves our attention. This passage confirms, therefore, the insight reached above for different reasons, that Arethas cannot be made responsible for the authorship of H_2, nor can we assume that he inspired this poor product. His manuscript A offers in the inscriptio the correct title of the first Platonic discourse. When Arethas or the member of the editorial staff who was in charge of collecting and preparing the material for the edition decided in favor of H_2, they evidently did not change its diction at all. The sentence which follows immediately after the reference to the discourse Ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς is the concluding sentence of that paragraph of H_2. Aristeides—the author says—with abundance of words (περιουσίᾳ λόγων) ἐπὶ τὸ τῶν ῥητόρων ἐνταῦθα καταβαίνει κεφάλαιον and, as it were in payment for an I.O. U., gives due support to the rhetoricians. The following brief sentence καὶ ἡ μὲν ὑπόθεσις αὕτη marks the end of the paragraph and indicates that the author has nothing else to say. The next section (170,8 ff.), the subject of which is a discussion of the εἶδος, has been examined above at the beginning of the analysis.

The question as to the bearing of the reference to the discourse Ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς remains unanswered if we limit ourselves to looking in H_2. Our impression is that it has no purpose at all. This view changes only if we turn back from H_2 to H_1. Then it appears that the epitomizer has suppressed all the essential elements: H_1 emphasizes what we can scarcely understand from the epitome H_2, that the first apology—158,4 the correct preposition ὑπὲρ is used again—focuses on the τέχνη, and that it is the special aim of Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων to make a plea for the men who practize the τέχνη, the rhetoricians. What he wishes to say is that both—Ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς is regarded as one discourse in spite of the bipartition mentioned above—discourses together form the entire defense. The previous discourse Ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς is the indispensable presupposition for the correct understanding of the shape and structure of the second oration Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων. The second is a δευτερολογία, and this type of oration does not require any prooemium of great extent. The discourses of Demosthenes which belong to the same group (i.e. the orations against Leptines and Androtion) are the prototype.

Only if we bear the peculiarity of δευτερολογία in mind, we are enabled to understand the first words of 'Υπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων—the author of H_1 says. Without this whole reasoning, however, which is missing in H_2 the reference to the discourse 'Υπὲρ ῥητορικῆς has no point, nor are there any other sufficient reasons for its being made in H_2. We are still in position to find out why the epitomizer contented himself with being so brief. He considered the comparison with 'Υπὲρ ῥητορικῆς and the discussion of the question of δευτερολογία unnecessary, because he knew that the first scholia on 'Υπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων contained a renewed and detailed discussion of the same subject. That was the decisive reason for his leaving out the concise statement of H_1. In consequence of his untimely briefness he mutilated the whole argument. The difficult opening scholia on 'Υπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων, of which I have given a detailed analysis in my *Untersuchungen zu den Aristeidesscholien*, p. 79 ff., belong to the valuable stock of the old Sopater scholia. Their text must be restored with the help of the leading manuscripts with scholia. One of the results of the analysis, the details of which I cannot repeat here, is the insight into their being closely related with H_1. A further result of the comparison between these scholia and H_1 is the desirable confirmation of the result attained above that Keil's hypothesis concerning Athanasius' authorship of H_1 is not right.

CHAPTER TWO

THE MANUSCRIPTS

Introduction

The critical analysis of the two redactions of H and the decision in favor of H_1 has enabled us to set up a more solid basis for the classification of the manuscripts. In general it may be said that more manuscripts are available for H_1 than for H_2. That is convincing proof that H_2, in spite of the influence which Arethas' manuscript exerted upon the tradition of the text of Aristeides and the scholia on the discourses, could not make headway against the higher authority of H_1. That Arethas gave preference to the poor version H_2 which represents an inadequate epitome of H_1, is a curiosity which cannot be explained convincingly. The circumstance that readers and students who were interested in rhetoric paid smaller attention to H_2 proves to be an advantage for its text which is relatively stationary and has only a few really important variants, whereas the very opposite is true of H_1. We must, therefore, infer that H_1 played an important role in the instruction of more advanced students of rhetoric and, consequently, was in greater danger of being adapted to actual purposes and of suffering change thereby. In the case of such a text we must expect as a matter of course to find the manuscripts in a state of contamination by which the different redactions were crossed. It would be, therefore, a methodical mistake to divide the manuscripts into distinct families or to construct a definite stemma. It is, however, quite possible to differentiate between certain groups.

M It seems a very plausible hypothesis that the two manuscripts which are of outstanding importance for restoring the older scholia have a similar authority for the text of H_1. These two manuscripts are **M** = Marc. graec. 423, a 12th or very early 13th century manuscript, and **v** = Vat. graec. 76, a 14th century manuscript. I have fully described them in the third chapter of my *Untersuchungen zu den Aristeidesscholien*, p. 29 ff. and 44 ff.

Let us begin with a special case. 164, 5 ff. the author reproduces a well known concept of Plato. In the Gorgias Socrates in order to define rhetoric divides κολακεία, in so far as it concerns

the human body, into κομμωτική (art of dressing) and μαγειρική (culinary art). Its activity and its effect are not very wholesome for the body: καὶ τοῦ σώματος εἶναι τήν τε κομμωτικήν. Then the author says in particular what κομμωτική means and adds in parenthesis: καλλωπίζουσι γὰρ αὗται, φησι, τὸ σῶμα. The second accusative μαγειρικήν which is parallel to τήν τε κομμωτικήν is introduced by εἶτα. The combination τε—εἶτα is not very common, it appears, however, although not quite in the same manner, in early Attic literature in Andocides I 58: ἐπαινέσοντάς τε ὑμᾶς, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ συνησθησομένους. τε—εἶτα has remained untouched in all manuscripts except **M**, in which εἶτα has been replaced by the normal καί, that is to say, we become aware of the tendency to adapt the words of the author to the more common usage. If that change of the original were an exceptional case, one might consider it accidental and irrelevant. This view is, however, absolutely wrong because similar cases in **M** are frequent throughout H_1. We can arrange these cases in the following four groups:

(1) Normalization of diction
(2) Simplification of word order
(3) Omission of parts of sentences
(4) Omission of words

The groups (3) and (4) which are not substantially different from each other originate in the tendency to abridge the text. I give a few examples for each of these groups:

(1) 161, 11 f. ἀλλὰ τοῖς κατανοεῖν δυναμένοις τέχνας τοῦτο δεδήλωκεν: τοῦτο οὖν τοῖς κατανοεῖν δυναμένοις δεδήλωκεν **M**

163, 7 f. ὁμοίως πάλιν καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δύο μέρη δίδωσι, τὴν νομοθετικὴν καὶ τὴν δικαστικήν: **M** replaces the prepositional expression which is very characteristic of the late Greek of the author and has many parallels in the scholia by the simple and common dative τῇ ψυχῇ.

(2) In the same passage **M** omits πάλιν, transfers δίδωσιν to the second place, i.e. after ὁμοίως, and writes μέρη δύο instead of δύο μέρη: in this way the redactor succeeds in placing the number immediately before the apposition which specifies the two parts.

158, 13 αὕτη μὲν τοῦ λόγου ἡ ὑπόθεσις: ἡ τοῦ λόγου ὑπόθεσις **M** with which **P** = Pal. graec. 319 and Marc. graec. 424 agree (see p. 32)

161, 10 f. τί οὖν ἄρα καὶ τὸ εἶδος λεκτέον τοῦ λόγου: τί οὖν ἄρα τὸ εἶδος τοῦ λόγου λεκτέον **M**; καὶ is also omitted in **v**.

(3) 158, 14-16 ὅτι μὲν οὖν οὐ τοῦ συμβουλευτικοῦ πρόδηλον. λείπεται τοίνυν ἑνὸς τῶν ἑτέρων εἶναι τὸν λόγον are omitted in **M** for obvious reasons: the reference to the συμβουλευτικός with which, according to the author, the oration has nothing in common is eliminated; the redactor of the text deemed it just as unnecessary as the consequence which is drawn from this negative statement that the discourse must belong to one of the other εἴδη. The first words after the omission are τινὲς μὲν οὖν instead of οἱ μὲν οὖν, a slight alteration of no importance.

159, 10 the reference ὡς ἔφαμεν is omitted in **M**.

159, 10-11 ὅπερ . . καὶ ὁ ῥήτωρ ἐν τῷ Περὶ στεφάνου πεποίηκε. κἀκεῖ μὲν γὰρ ὁ Δημοσθένης πολλάκις ἑαυτὸν ἐνεκωμίασεν: ὅπερ . . . . πεποίηκε πολλάκις ἑαυτὸν ἐγκωμιάσας; an evident reduction which was made in order to spare the words ἐκεῖ μὲν γὰρ ὁ Δημοσθένης.

159, 12 f. πρὸς τὴν κατηγορίαν Αἰσχίνου καὶ ὧν κατηγόρησε: πρὸς ἃ κατηγόρησεν Αἰσχίνης **M** in order to eliminate the seeming repetition.

161, 4 f. ἀπορήσας καὶ ἀποδείξας ὡς οὐδετέρου (οὐδέτερον mss.) τῶν εἰδῶν δύναται εἶναι ὁ λόγος, ἀνασκευὴν αὐτὸν ἀπεφήνατο: the words καὶ ἀποδείξας—λόγος are missing in **M**.

161, 7 f. ὡμολόγηται γὰρ ὡς πολὺ τῆς ὑποθέσεως διενήνοχε τὰ προγυμνάσματα: ὡμολόγηται ὡς are omitted, and γὰρ is placed after πολὺ, cf. under (4) 162, 7.

161, 8 f. τὰ δὲ μέρη τῆς ὑποθέσεως καὶ ἀμφισβήτησιν ἐπιδέχεται: καὶ—ἐπιδέχεται are missing in **M**.

161, 12 ἐν τοῖς Προγυμνάσμασιν: the important reference to Theon's work is omitted in **M**.

162, 10 f. καὶ τὴν μὲν ἀρίστην, ἥτις παρασκευάζει ἄριστον εἶναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον: τὴν μὲν ἀρίστην **M**, the relative clause is missing, and the words before were changed.

163, 4 f. ἡ μὲν γὰρ ὅλως, φησίν, οὐ συγχωρεῖ νοσεῖν τὴν ἀρχήν, ἡ γυμναστική: ἡ μὲν γὰρ οὐ συγχωρεῖ νοσεῖν **M.**

(4) 160, 1 f. ὅταν μὲν γὰρ αὐθαίρετον καὶ προηγούμενον ἔχωμεν τὸν ἔπαινον: καὶ προηγούμενον is omitted in **M.**

162, 1 δέ at the beginning of the quotation from Theon is missing in **M**. The consequence of this omission is that the link between the sentence quoted from Theon and the sentence which preceded it in Theon's work is removed, and the quotation has become self-dependent. The author, however, who included the conjunction in the quotation was almost pedantic.

162, 1 f. ὅπερ οὐκέτι μὲν τυγχάνει προγύμνασμα: ὅπερ οὐκ ἔστι προγύμνασμα **M**: unless there is the common confusion between ἔτι and ἔστι, it is the purpose also of this change to untie the quotation, since οὐκέτι looks back to some argument or thought previously discussed in Theon's work.

162, 7 ἐκεῖνο δὲ παρατηρητέον, ὅτι Πλάτων: παρατηρητέον δὲ ὅτι Πλάτων **M.**

Although this collection was taken out of larger material available in **M**, it is quite sufficient, or perhaps even more than that, to decide on the question to what degree **M** is useful for the text of H_1. Most of the changes listed above are individual features of **M.** They are not symptomatic of a process of increasing carelessness about the text, but rather the result of a transformation according to plan, which affects the whole of H_1. Their character is quite different from the substantial changes which were made in the epitome H_2, whose author does not keep clear of destroying the logical order of the arguments and even of making them meaningless; the redactor of the text in **M**, however, sticks firmly to the original. He does not destroy it, he rather retouches it. There is no similar case of so consistent and deliberate a manipulation which is offered in any other manuscript, although occasional attempts in the same direction may be found here and there. If an editor of H_1 should decide to reproduce the redaction **M** in a parallel column beside the text which is based upon the rest of the manu-

scripts, in order to illuminate more impressively the history of the tradition, he could scarcely be criticized. This general insight into the character and purpose of the text in **M** does not release the editor from the obligation to examine the variants in **M**. It cannot be denied on principle that some of them may appear to be correct and genuine and that the original words became lost in the other manuscripts. This alternative must, at least theoretically, be taken into serious account although, practically, in the great majority of cases an unequivocal decision cannot be easily reached. I have already (see p. 28) called attention to 158, 16 τινὲς μὲν οὖν instead of οἱ μὲν οὖν. In the same category fall 161, 3 τοιγάρτοι **M** instead of καὶ γάρ τοι and 162, 6 καὶ ταῦτα μὲν καὶ περὶ τοῦ εἴδους: ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τοῦ εἴδους **M**, although I think that, in this case we shall have to decide against **M**. That **M** is doubtless wrong in omitting the first καί, is guaranteed by 158, 13 καὶ αὕτη μὲν τοῦ λόγου ἡ ὑπόθεσις. As this sentence is logically the last of a paragraph, it has the decisive value of a real parallel and demonstrates the usage of the author. I lay less emphasis upon the coincidence with a passage of P which, at the end of a paragraph again, we read 149, 12 f. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον. The second καί (after ταῦτα μὲν) in the rest of the manuscripts could be an erroneous repetition. There is, however, no evidence because, a few lines before (161, 10 f.), the author says τί οὖν ἄρα καὶ τὸ εἶδος λεκτέον τοῦ λόγου. Since here not only καί is omitted in **M** (and **v**) again but **M** places the words τοῦ λόγου before λεκτέον in order to normalize the word order, we should not be inclined to pay too much heed to **M** on p. 162, 6. Finally it is noteworthy that in the corrupt passage 162, 4 f. it is just the manuscript **M** which makes of all manuscripts the most daring attempt of emendation, although we must admit that it was done in a skilful manner. [1])

The riddle why **M** has so pre-eminent an importance for the scholia but is so different in H_1 is not insoluble. The manuscript was written by one copyist. He used up to f. 190^v green-brown ink. For the second section of the text of the orations and for the scholia he used brown ink. This difference of ink indicates that the scholia, including those on the text written with green-brown ink, were

1) Cf. also p. 34; for details I refer to the apparatus criticus.

added after the whole text was completed. Did the scribe copy them from a different original? H_1 which covers in **M** f. 132^r-136^v belongs to the first, i.e. the green-brown, section. Now there is one passage in H_1 which gives full evidence that the scribe could not decipher the manuscript he had set out to copy. 163, 5 f. **M** has, in accordance with the other manuscripts, καὶ ἀμφοτέρας μὲν ἐπαινεῖ. After ἐπαινεῖ the page ends, the next words τὰς παρασκευάς, ἐπὶ are omitted, because they seemed to be unnecessary or because the redactor, following his rules discussed above, wished to change ἐπὶ πλέον to πλέον or because of an excusable carelessness which easily happens in the transition from one page to the other. Then it goes on: δὲ τὴν . δέον γάρ φησι μὴ νοσεῖν (instead of φησὶ γὰρ μὴ νοσεῖν ὅλως ἀρχήν: there appears again the tendency to make the sense more intelligible and to polish the diction) ἢ νοσοῦντα θεραπεύεσθαι. After τὴν the scribe left a space free but filled it later on, supplying the missing noun γυμναστικήν. In so doing he used the same ink with which he wrote the scholia. The most plausible explanation is that later on a second original became available with whose help he was in position to complete the passage.

A few lines after this passage we read (163, 9 f.) τά τε δίκαια καὶ τὰ καλὰ καὶ τὰ συμφέροντα. **M** omits τε and καὶ τὰ καλά: it does not matter whether by carelessness or reproducing a change made by the redactor of the text. The double omission seems, however, to favor the second alternative. Again the words καὶ τὰ καλὰ were supplied with brown ink, this time, however, between the lines. A certain number of corrections of the same type appears also in the text of the Panathenaicus which belongs entirely to the section which was written with green-brown ink.

The result of this discussion is very neat, and the question as to the reason for the difference between the value of the text of the scholia and H_1 has received its answer. If the excellent scholia (brown) were copied from a manuscript other than the green-brown section which includes H_1, the two originals used by the scribe were unequal in value. The scholia had not to go through the stage of retouches by the hand of that redactor whose activity we have traced throughout H_1.

Groups of manuscripts: H_1

After segregating **M** from the rest of the manuscripts we must make a definite attempt to group them. In this attempt the passage 163, 6 which I have discussed just before proves helpful again. We have seen that, after the lacuna which later on was filled by γυμναστικὴν in the correct way, the redactor **M** changed the text following his principles. After ἐπὶ πλέον δὲ τὴν γυμναστικὴν there follows in the original text the genitive of comparison τῆς ἰατρικῆς which is not essential to the construction and the bearing of the sentence but in harmony with the style of the author who also elsewhere is fond of repeating the same matter with small variations in order to express a thought as exhaustively as possible and not to leave any doubt about his meaning. 159, 12 f. (see p. 28) is a very good illustration of this peculiarity of style. It is not surprising that **M** omitted the words τῆς ἰατρικῆς, this time, however, they are not missing in **M** alone but in three other manuscripts: **L**
LPb (= Laur. 60, 9) [1]) **P** (= Pal. graec. 319) **b** (= Vat. Regin. 120). All of them are as late as 15th century and for the text of the orations without any, or so far as **L** is concerned, of very restricted value. In H_1 they form a group which, then and now, is strengthened
m or rather enlarged by **M** and **m** = Marc. graec. 424 which also belongs to the 15th century. This group offers a text which, on considerably lower level however, is based upon similar principles as **M**. The main difference is that the text of this group is not so much the result of consequent, although not praiseworthy, retouches but of vulgarization. **P** and **b** are more closely related with each other. **L** stands more apart because, on the other hand, it often agrees with those manuscripts which did not undergo the characteristic changes of words or word order or present the abridged text. The peculiarities of this group may be illustrated by some examples: 157, 3 ὁ τῶν τυράννων βίος καὶ ὁ τῶν ῥητόρων: καὶ τῶν ῥητόρων **LPbm**; 157, 5 f. Γοργίαν ἐπικαλούμενον: οὕτω καλούμενον **LPbm**; 158, 2 δεῖξαι αὐτὴν πρῶτον μὲν κρείττονα τέχνης: δεῖξαι ταύτην κρείττονα τέχνης **LPbm**; 159, 2 f. τὸν Περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου λόγον ἢ τὸν πρὸς Λεπτίνην: λόγον is placed after Λεπτίνην **LPb**; 159, 8

1) See my *Untersuchungen zu den Aristeidesscholien*, p. 96.

ποιεῖται τὴν αὔξησιν: τὴν is missing in **LPb**; 160, 3 ποιεῖται τὴν ὑπόθεσιν: ποιούμεθα **LPb**; 160, 9 κολακείαν αὐτῶν κατηγόρησεν: αὐτὴν **LPb**; 161, 1 f. τοῦ δικανικοῦ εἴδους δύναται εἶναι ὁ λόγος: ὁ λόγος εἶναι **Pb**, not **L**; 165, 2 φησι τήν τε σοφιστικὴν καὶ τὴν ῥητορικήν: φησιν εἶναι **LPb**.

All these evident inadequacies are counterbalanced, however, by the circumstance that the agreement between **Lb** and **M** from which I started the inquiry on p. 32 proved to be very important for the interpretation of 161, 11 f. (see p. 9 and 13). The bearing of the whole passage changes if we omit the personal pronoun ἡμῖν with **MLb** or if we accept it with the rest of the manuscripts. I need not, however, repeat the details given above.

Two other passages confirm not only the attempt to form the manuscripts **LPb** into one group but enable us to coordinate some other manuscripts to which we have not as yet paid much attention. In so doing we always must bear in mind that, in the case of a text which was in permanent use in schools of rhetoric combinations of and confusions between the different redactions of a text-book were unavoidable, in other words: we must expect to find important traces of contamination. Almost every line of the apparatus criticus proves that this contamination did take place and that the border-line between the groups is not rigidly fixed. Since a mere accumulation of examples is of no use, I restrict myself to discussing two passages, of which 164, 2 ff. is especially significant. The words τὴν ἀρίστην παρασκευὴν are used in two successive lines. No wonder that the repetition of the same words caused confusion, omissions and erroneous corrections. The manuscripts **MR** (= Vat. graec. 1298, an 11th century manuscript) **V** (= Marc. app. VIII 7, also an 11th century manuscript [1])) **p** (= Pal. graec. 90, a 13th or 14th century manuscript) have the correct text. That is not relevant to our purpose since on the basis

1) Strictly speaking this date is not true of H_1 which was misplaced among the Prolegomena in V and covers f. 2ᵛ. The original 11th century leaves 1ʳ-6ᵛ which contained most of the Prolegomena had been damaged and had to be replaced by a new copy which was made in the 15th century, apparently after the old original. As immediate introduction to Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων H_2 had been substituted for H_1 already in the old original. Most of H_2, however, together with the beginning of the discourse, was lost.

of positive agreement, i.e. of the correct text appearing in two or more manuscripts, relations between various manuscripts can never be established. The only practical basis for claiming manuscripts as related to each other can be found in agreement in characteristic mistakes. In our special case the grouping of the manuscripts which are wrong is significant. On the one hand we have again the group **Pb** to which **L** is close, on the other hand the passage is treated in similar ways in ***A*** (= Vat. graec. 1899, a 13th century manuscript) and **v**. For the details I refer to the apparatus criticus.

Another passage (162, 4 f.) is still more characteristic for the simple reason that the corruption has affected all our manuscripts. The question how the corruption can be removed is not so important for the present problem. I refer, therefore, to the apparatus criticus where I have made some suggestion. Much more important, however, is it to emphasize that we find again those three groups ***A*v**, **RV** and **LPb** whereas **M** stands apart and makes a skilfull but violent and doubtless unsuccessful attempt to emend the corrupt passage. **p** disagrees with **RV** at the beginning. That is not surprising since it is also elsewhere in looser connection with the two

RV other representatives of the group. The main question is: do we have any important reason for placing **R** and **V** into one group? I think we have. 163, 4 f. the γυμναστική is characterized as prophylaxis, it guards the human body against the incidence of diseases; medicine, however, is concerned with the sick: ἰατρικὴ τὸν νοσοῦντα θεραπεύει. The participle τὸν νοσοῦντα is replaced by the neuter τὸ νοσοῦν in **RVp**. It refers to the preceding words σώματος θεραπείαν. Since, immediately after, the author repeats his words with slight alterations and says (6 f.) φησὶ γὰρ μὴ νοσεῖν ὅλως ἀρχὴν ἢ νοσοῦντα θεραπεύεσθαι, it is more probable that he used also in the previous passage the masculine which is also confirmed by the groups ***A*v**, **M** and **Lpb** which are supported by another recent manuscript, the Laur. 60, 12 (**l**) although otherwise it does not belong to any of them. The neuter must be considered a clever improvisation of the group **RV(p)**, I refrain from accumulating further examples since they would not throw any more light upon the fundamental question of the grouping of the manuscripts. I would add only

that **r** also, the more recent supplementary parts of **R** which has not been preserved in its original completeness, is not very remote from that group. **r**

Finally, a few more words must be devoted to the manuscript ***A*** to which I have already referred in discussing **v** (see p. 34). In his Praef. II, p. IX Keil calls it an apograph of the manuscript of Arethas but denies that it was copied from that original directly. ***A*** has the same content and places the orations in the same order as the manuscript of Arethas. Since ***A***, however, contains H_1, the manuscript of Arethas, however, H_2, we must infer that another manuscript was used (additionally?) when ***A*** was composed.

Result

The examination of the manuscripts on which the text of H_1 must be based has yielded a clear result. There is no "leading" manuscript available that the editor may rely upon with confidence, although two of them, **R** and **V** [1], are as early as 11th century and a third one, **M**, is not much later. The lack of a leading manuscript is not surprising after all we have had to say about the history of this text which originates in lectures and was written down as a textbook for students. This purpose explains completely the many changes the text underwent in antiquity and in the centuries of the Byzantine era prior to our oldest manuscripts. When H_1 was placed before the discourse Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων to serve as introduction, an "authentic" text was no longer available for copying. Under these circumstances the modern editor has no choise between different ways. In a case like this the eclectic method is the only possible one. Fortunately, however, it is somewhat restricted by the possibility of forming the manuscripts into groups. This possibility gives to the editor some trustworthy criteria. If ***A*v** and **RV** agree with each other, the variant appearing in both groups usually gains momentum and should not be underrated. If these two groups stand together against **LPb**, we must have very important reasons for giving preference to **LPb**. If the two groups are supported even by **L** disagreeing with **Pb**, the probability which speaks for **Pb** sinks almost to zero. If they are

[1]) See, however, p. 33, n. 1.

strengthened by **M** which represents the consistently retouched version, this concordance bears heavily. On the other hand, if **M** agrees with **LPb** or **Pb**, we shall rather have to infer that the original text of H_1 was changed.

Manuscripts of H_2

The problem of laying the foundations for the text of the epitome H_2 is much less complicated. The most important question is as to the form or version of the text of H_1 which was used by the compiler of H_2. Although the material suitable for a comparison is unfortunately not large enough to enable us to draw immediate conclusions of absolute certainty, yet some available details give valuable hints. Plato wrote a dialogue Γοργίαν ἐπικαλούμενον (H_1 157, 5 f.). The same statement is made in H_2 169, 6 where, however, by a trivialization of style, the words are changed to Γοργίαν οὕτω καλούμενον. The same change of the original was also made in H_1 by the entire group **LPbm** which is of very small value (see p. 32) because of its tendency to popularize and conventionalize the text. Are we to suppose that on the contrary the text of H_2 exercised some influence upon this group of manuscripts of H_1 and left its traces in it? We certainly are not. H_1 160, 6 f. οὐδὲ γὰρ τούτου πάλιν φυλάττει τὸ ἴδιον $\sim$ H_2 171, 13 f. οὐδὲ γὰρ τούτου φυλάττει τὸ ἴδιον = **L**. H_1 160, 11 f. κολακεία γὰρ μισεῖται μέν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἤδη καὶ κολάζεται. It is not surprising that καὶ caused trouble and seemed to be unnecessary. It is, therefore, omitted in **Lb** with which also **l** agrees and is missing in H_2 171, 16. These cases favor the alternative that either the original text of H_1, after which H_2 was compiled, was a representative of the group **LPb**, or closely related with it. I think that we must decide in favor of the second alternative for the following reason: in H_2 171, 13$\sim$$H_1$ 160, 6 there is a little but strange agreement between H_2 and the erroneous text of another group of manuscripts of H_1: οὐ μὴν τοῦ δικανικοῦ εἴδους δύναται εἶναι ὁ λόγος is the correct text of H_1 but **Vpr** have an additional οὐδὲ after οὐ μὴν. οὐδὲ was known also to the copyist of **L** who placed it, however, differently and changed the original text to ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μὴν, and to H_2 which this time does not agree with **L** but with **Vpr**: οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τῷ δικανικῷ κοινωνίαν ἔχει ὁ λόγος.

The original text of H_1 which was used by the redactor of H_2 having also this variant was a contamination of the text of the two groups **VR(r)p** and **LPb**. From this we must infer that the text of the group **LPb** which is one of the more recent ones was not established in the later Byzantine era or even in the Renaissance but was current when Arethas and his staff took the preliminary steps to complete the exegetical edition of Aristeides which is represented by the old manuscript **A**, that is to say: the text of **LPb** must be attributed to later antiquity or to the very early Byzantine era.

Groups of manuscripts

Among the manuscripts of H_2 one group stands apart and can be easily separated from the rest of the manuscripts. It consists of four manuscripts, three of which come to an end as early as 170, 7. The epitome H_2 underwent in them new changes, inasmuch as seemingly unnecessary parts of sentences were omitted and more difficult words explained by exegetical additions. I scarcely need say that **A** does not belong to this group, which nowhere seems to be reliable unless its variants are supported by other manuscripts. The four manuscripts are **L** (= Laur. 60, 6 of the 15th century) **LQTa** **Q** (= Vat. graec. 1297 of the end of the 12th century[1])) **T** (= Laur. 60, 8 of the 11th century[2])) **a** (= Ambr. A 175 sup. of the 14th century[3])). A few examples make it sufficiently clear that we have no reason for trusting the variants of these manuscripts: 169, 3 they borrow from H_1 εἰς φιλοσοφίαν and add it after προτρέπεται, 169, 7 διασύρει after αὐτὴν, 169, 9 after τὴν κατηγορίαν ποιούμενος they make the long addition οὐ (οὐδὲ **L**) γὰρ προηγουμένως οὐδ'ἐξ ἀρχῆς τοῦτο προθέμενος, ἀλλά. These words were taken from H_1 157, 9 f. or in other words: H_2 was here interpolated from a different passage of H_1; 169, 16 the words ὁ θεῖος γενόμενος are missing.

170, 7 **a** suddenly changes its position in a very interesting **a** manner. Whereas up to this point **a** agrees with **LQT** exclusively

1) See Keil, *Praef.* II, p. X f.; cf. F. Lenz, *Herm.* LXVI (1931), p. 58.
2) See Keil, l.c., p. XIII f.
3) See my *Untersuchungen zu den Aristeidesscholien,* p. 62 f.

it is from now on so closely connected with **K** (= Vat. graec. 74, a 12th century manuscript [1]) that there is but one explanation possible: up to 170, 7 **a** and **LQT** also were copied from an original which did not include the complete hypothesis H_2 but only its first section. The scribes of the three manuscripts contented themselves with copying what they found in their common original, **a**, however, did not, but supplemented the fragment with the help of a manuscript whose text strikingly resembled **K**. In the transition from one original to the other, immediately before the first original ceases, **a** has the two variants ἀπονέμων in the text and ἀπονέμει in the margin, in which it agrees not only with **LQT** but also with **K**, the only manuscript that has the indicative. The explanation is; when the copyist searched for the first words he had to copy from the second original, he noticed the variant and wrote it down in the margin. With **K** another manuscript no less untrustworthy, the Vat. graec. 933, is closely related both in H_2 and in the scholia [2], and two more recent manuscripts of small value belong to the same group, Paris. graec. 2952 and 2953. The two groups **LQTa** (1st section) and **K a** (2nd section) Paris. 2952. 2953 are typical representatives of the so called codices deteriores. Not all of them are, as I have shown on p. 37, "recentiores" at the same time. They are counterpoised by **A** whose authority is strengthened by **R** and, up to 169, 9 (see p. 33, n. 1) by **V**. The difficulties in establishing these groups are considerably less than in the case of H_1. The main reason is that apparently H_2 was much less used in schools of rhetoric. It was a product too poor to satisfy higher claims by professors and advanced students. This is no disadvantage for the text, which did not to the same extent as the text of H_1 suffer permanent contamination.

ARV

The practical consequences for the editor of H_2 are clear. He must place a high value on the agreement of **AR** and, up to 169, 9, also of **V**. If one of the two other groups agrees with **AR(V)** against the third, there is scarcely any reason to disregard this agreement, which speaks against the authority of the variants of the third

1) See F. Lenz, *Herm.* LXVI (1931), p. 57 f.

2) See my *Untersuchungen zu den Artisteidesscholien*, p. 50 and cf. *Herm.* LXVI (1931), p. 57, n. 1.

group. If these two groups become associated with each other against **AR**, this agreement may suggest that an earlier variant has been preserved which must be carefully examined before a decision is made against **AR**, unless these two manuscripts offer a manifestly erroneous variant or an evident mistake.

Dindorf did not know any of all these manuscripts but based the text only upon the inadequate recent manuscript A. He was, therefore, unable to offer a real recensio and contented himself with giving a version which is not only full of mistakes but contains even unintelligible sentences and mutilated words.

CHAPTER THREE

I. THE PROLEGOMENA PROPER

Outline of the problem

For several reasons the difficulties in establishing a critical text of P are much greater than in the case of H. The most important question is the reconstruction of the history of the text. Are we in position to restore stages through which this textbook went? A clear answer to this question is the necessary presupposition for the fundamental problem: which one of the different redactions is the modern editor to present? The main obstacle is again, as in the case of H_1, that no manuscript has an entitled claim to be considered "leading" because of its higher authority. Another unfavorable circumstance is perhaps still worse: the order of the various sections of P in the manuscripts is subject to so many changes, some of which are in open conflict with the rules of logic, that, at first glance, it seems almost impossible to find a starting point for the analysis. The suspicion arises, therefore, that we may be wrong in regarding P as a unit consisting of consecutive treatises, all of which discuss, from various points of view, Aristeides' technique and style. Perhaps we are no less wrong in thinking that their author or the redactor of the collection placed them in a certain deliberate order. A second possibility is that these treatises were composed by one or several authors not in their present sequence, but at different times and stages of studies devoted to Aristeides, and represent discussions and topics from divergent or even opposite points of view. There is also a third possibility which must be taken into account. It is, to some extent, a subdivision of the second possibility: If the whole P must be attributed to the same author who wrote them at various stages of his research, some of the more recent treatises may have been composed to replace earlier attempts made in the same direction. It is by no means without example that the earlier redaction was not destroyed by the author and that both were published by a scrupulous editor who found them among the papers of the writer. The modern editor, studying the history of such a text, has to face the difficult and

unpleasant question of how to present such parallel versions, whether in sequence or in parallel columns.

The subjects discussed in H and in some sections of P are so close to each other that it is not surprising that the two separate treatises H and P were in some places and in some manuscripts [1]) blended together into a hopeless conflation. In this case the disposition of the manuscripts cannot be shown by one formula: it is not the older manuscripts which distinctly separate H and P from each other, nor is it the bulk of more recent manuscripts which are the only ones to mix them up in a hopeless chaos, but both groups show the same virtues and the same defects, with the only difference that the situation is more confused in those of the more recent manuscripts, whose redactors or copyists were not capable of any reasonable reflection on or understanding of the material they were handling.

Contents of P

In order to make an approach to the conglomeration P it seems best to begin with a brief survey of the various sections as they are presented in Dindorf's edition vol. III, pp. 737-757. [2]) The opening section is chiefly biographical. I call it for the sake of briefness B (110-117). The content of the next section which is a B
sequel to B is not biographical in the modern sense of the term. Its subject is rather an inquiry into the specific character of Aristeides' style. It begins with the words 118, 1 περὶ δὲ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος and ends 119, 6. I call it C. The next section (120-125) is an C
introduction into the Panathenaicus (Pan.). A long section which Pan.
has received in Dindorf's edition the wrong title Εἰς τοὺς περὶ ῥητορικῆς λόγους follows. Its main subject being, however, the discourse Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων, I call it Te. It has two subdivisions, Te.
the former (T), from 126 up to 141, 3, centers on the content T
of the discourse, the second, from 141, 4 up to 151, focuses on its εἶδος (E). To these sections a fifth, or, if we count the fourth E
(Te.) as two (T and E), a sixth, must be added which had not come to Dindorf's knowledge. The first impression is that it represents an enlarged parallel version of C (152-155). I call it C^a (a = auctus). C^a

1) Cf. for instance p. 33, n. 1. 2) In this edition pp. 110-155.

Before we attempt to analyze and to compare these sections with each other, we must take a preliminary step and show how differently H and P are associated in the manuscripts. One manuscript whose redactor or copyist was able to reflect on what he was arranging or writing is **p** (= Pal. graec. 90).[1] **p** places H_1 between Pan. and Te. and calls it Προλεγόμενα ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων instead of Ὑπόθεσις. At the beginning of Te. there is the marginal note εἰς τὸ αὐτό. Since **p** obviously does not make any distinction between the purpose of H_1 and Te., this marginal note indicates to the reader that Te. is a parallel version or a doublet of H_1. In the transition from T to E where **p** in agreement with other manuscripts, e.g. **A** and **v**, adds γὰρ after φασί, there is another marginal note which reads as follows: περὶ τοῦ εἴδους τοῦ λόγου. This note must not mean that the copyist wishes to mark the beginning of a new independent section, it is rather his custom to indicate by brief rubrics of this kind that the author is going to discuss a different subject. E ends in **p** 150, 15. Instead of the sentence 151, 1 ταῦτ' ἐγώ σοι Σώπατρος ἐπιδίδωμι—3 συνήγαγον which contains the σφραγίς, however, it has καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον. This is continued by C^a, the first words of which are περιττὸς δὲ καὶ ἐνθυμηματικὸς ὢν with the rubric περὶ τῆς ἐν λόγοις ἰδιότητος ἀριστείδου τοῦ ῥήτορος.

Pal. gr. 29 Vat. gr. 77

From **p** Pal. graec. 29 is different, inasmuch as it inserts H_1 between T and E, and different again is Vat. graec. 77 which has H_1 after T but omits E; in this manuscript there is much further confusion which need not be discussed here. Thus we have, in three manuscripts of the 14th or, if **p** is as early as 13th century, in two manuscripts of the 14th and in one of the 13th century the following three types of arranging H_1 T E:

p: H_1 Te. (= T and E) C^a
Pal. graec. 29: T H_1 E
Vat. graec. 77: T H_1 (E is missing)

These variations give sufficient proof that the Byzantine philol-

1) See the more detailed description in *my Untersuchungen zu den Aristeidesscholien*, p. 110 f.

ogists who are responsible for these manuscripts had no clear idea of the true relation between P and H. Unfortunately **V**, the only **V** old[1]) manuscript that has to be taken into consideration for the association of H and P, is but of restricted use in this case. Since the first six leaves of **V** were supplied by a hand of the 15th century, which imitated the old characters and possibly copied the damaged leaves which were to be replaced[2]), some feeling of uncertainty cannot be eliminated. As the manuscript stands now the hand of the original copyist begins f. 7^r 143, 1 in E in the midst of the word (δικα)νικῆς. With the necessary reservation that the lost original and the supplied 15th century leaves possibly did not entirely agree, the present situation in **V** is the following: The first place is taken by C, the last brief sentence of which οὐ πάνυ δὲ γηραιὸς τέθνηκε is omitted (119, 6). Next comes H_1, then B, at the end of which (117, 13) the sentence οὐ πάνυ δὲ γηραιὸς τέθνηκε which is missing in C is added, and finally Pan. Te. (i.e. T and E) and C^a. The arrangement C H_1 B is quite unreasonable. So far as C is concerned its place at the beginning of P is unjustifiable and unique. That might raise the suspicion that the man who supplied **V** made a mistake, separating C from B. To this assumption we must object, however, that it is not any other section of P which was intercalated but H_1. There are no external reasons, such as considerations of space, for assuming that the supplying copyist needed less space than the original scribe and that he wished to fill out some available free space with a kind of stop-gap. Since the arrangement C H_1 B does not seem to be fortuitous or arbitrary, we must believe that it was made by the original copyist of **V** for some unrecognizable reason. An attempt to explain this strange situation, however, can be made. **V** is the only old manuscript that offers both H_1 and H_2 (see p. 33, n. 1). H_2 was placed before the text of Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων and is supposed to serve as introduction to it. In consequence of that arrangement another place had to be found for H_1 which the redactor of **V** was unwilling to miss. Several places could be thought of: either before H_2 and the discourse or after the discourse

1) The term "old manuscript" means in this case manuscripts of the 11th and 12th century, since A, the manuscript of Arethas, does not contain P.
2) See p. 33, n. 1.

or at the beginning or the end of the manuscript. He decided in favor of the beginning but felt that in this case H_1, now being separated from the discourse, had become independent against its character and purpose: for it was an absurd idea to open the manuscript with an introduction to the oration for the four statesmen if, instead of the discourse, B and C were to follow. To render this displacement less striking he changed the order B C to C B. In this way C which discusses Aristeides' style in more general terms changed its character and became a general introduction into Aristeides' writings. After C, for whatever reasons, if my attempt of explanation should not hit the mark, was given the first place in the manuscript, P now begins with the words Περὶ δὲ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος. I do not expect anyone, for justifying this stylistic error of inserting δὲ, to refer to the famous beginning of Xenophon's Oeconomicus Ἤκουσα δέ ποτε αὐτοῦ, but rather think that this little detail indicates that the one who was responsible for **V** acted upon his own account. In any case it appears that we are not permitted to base the analysis upon **V** and to trust **V** for the only reason that it is in P one of the oldest manuscripts if not the oldest of all, any more than **R M K** and those many more recent manuscripts in which with good reasons H_1 is distinctly separated from P, and B placed before C.

Previous result: E

The analysis of H_1 has yielded also one previous result for P. Although Te. unmistakably agrees in various aspects with Sopater's rhetorical doctrine as propounded in H_1 (see p. 15 f.), yet its second subdivision E shows a noteworthy progress beyond that doctrine and a much more decided attitude than H on the main question of the εἶδος. This statement enabled us to infer that E must be attributed to a more recent stage in the development of Sopater's interpretation of Aristeides.

II. THE BIOGRAPHY (B)

A more general consideration will enable us to draw an important conclusion for B. For a long time it had become quite usual to

place at the beginning of an ancient edition of a poet or prose writer an introductory biography. It is a well known fact which now, after many previous studies of the different types of ancient biographies, need not be illustrated again that such an ancient biography cannot be compared with its counterpart in editions of modern poets or prose writers. Under these circumstances we shall scarcely go wrong if we claim the first place in P for B. The best analogy available to us, with which we shall have to deal in more details below, is the life of Demosthenes, which had its place at the beginning of ancient editions.

Manuscripts

Most of the manuscripts on which the text of B must be based have been characterized in the chapter about H_1 (p. 26 ff.). It is therefore not necessary to discuss them again nor is it necessary to describe those manuscripts which I have used for the text but occasionally: they do not enable us to draw further conclusions. It is, however, necessary to call attention to some details which are important for the history of the text. I have already said on p. 43 that in **V** B has lost its place as opening treatise. The same is true of **R**, the second of the old manuscripts available for P. In **R**, too, B has not its appropriate place at the beginning. Just as in **V** some of the original sections or leaves of **R** were damaged and supplied by a more recent copyist (**r**). The first leaves of the present manuscript, which were written by **r**, are filled by Pan. The original scribe now starts with T from its beginning up to 137, 8 εἰπεῖν (f. 3^v). There is no reason for thinking that it was the copyist **r** who changed the original arrangement arbitrarily removing B from the first place. On f. 4^r **r** starts again with 137, 8 οὐδὲν, that is to say he begins immediately after **R** ends and goes on up to the end of T 141, 3 κείμενα, omitting, however, the last sentence καὶ νῦν εἰ δοκεῖ σαφέστερον τοῦτο ὀψώμεθα, the functional purpose of which is to link, in the whole treatise Te., the two subdivisions T and E and to form a transition from T to E. With this tendency to separate E from T the circumstance, that the sentence preceding in T, which also announces E as coming next, δείκνυσι γὰρ καὶ τὸ εἶδος τοῦ λόγου σαφῶς τὰ πράγματα κείμενα was not omitted,

The arrangement T E is original

conflicts strangely, however. It goes without saying that this situation is not in harmony with the original concept either of the author himself or of the redactor who was in charge of the publication of the author's papers. As it stands now the last sentence of T has in **r** no bearing whatsoever after E was cut off and the original order T E destroyed. E, the special discussion of the εἶδος of the discourse 'Υπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων, was to follow immediately the general treatment of the oration (T). The actual consequences of this insight are that the modern editor cannot base the arrangement of the treatises on **R** and that, so far as this question is concerned, both of the old manuscripts (**R V**) must be eliminated. In all probability the more recent scribes who supplied the damaged originals cannot be made responsible. Since in replacing the defective leaves of **R**, **r** needed less space, f. 4ᵛ became useless and remained empty. On f. 5ʳ **R** began again and wrote up to f. 6ᵛ. These two leaves contain B (up to 117, 13 μόνον), C (up to 119, 6 τέθνηκεν) and—E up to 146, 6 ἔχθραν. It appears again that it was not by the fault of **r** that T and E were separated from each other. f. 7ʳ⁻ᵛ were supplied by **r**. f. 7ʳ covers the rest of E except for the σφραγίς 151, 1 ταῦτ' ἐγώ σοι Σώπατρος—3 συνήγαγον which is missing. In its stead we have the brief sentence ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον. Then follows immediately after, beginning still on f. 7ʳ and ending on f. 7ᵛ, Cᵃ. The opening words περιττὸς δὲ καὶ ἐνθυμηματικὸς ὢν agree with **p** (see p. 42), the concluding words are ἀλλ' ὥρα λοιπὸν ἐπ' αὐτὴν τῶν ἐδαφίων ἐλθεῖν ἐξέτασιν.

P The manuscript **P** (= Paris. graec. 2948, 12th century) has not been referred to as yet. Many years ago I was able to prove [1]) that **P** was never an independent manuscript. It is rather the first part of another manuscript, the Oxon. Canon. graec. 1 (**B** in the second volume of Keil's edition of Aristeides). The original manuscript was taken to pieces as was the manuscript of Arethas (**A**), the two sections of which are now in Paris (Paris. graec. 2951) and Florence (Laur. 60, 3). Full details about the contents of **P** are given in my paper; here, however, we must limit ourselves to P. The order of the sections of which P is composed and their text

K for the most part agree with **K** (= Vat. graec. 74, 12th century).

1) See F. Lenz. *Herm.* LXV (1930), p. 209 ff.

The resemblance is so striking that I prefer to depend in the following description on **K** rather than on **P**, and I content myself with giving a few additional references to **P** whenever it becomes desirable. I was in position to collate **K** much more leisurely than **P**. **K** presents the sections of P in the following order: B 111-117, 14 τέθνηκεν [1]) f. 3^r-4^r; C 118, 1-119, 6 χρῆται (**K**: χρᾶται **P**) f. 4^r; Pan. 121, 1-125, 3 f. 4^r-4^v; Te., that is to say T 127, 1-141, 3 f. 4^v-6^v and, after a new title, E 141, 5-150, 15—instead of the σφραγίς 151, 1 ταῦτ' ἐγώ σοι Σώπατρος—3 συνήγαγον **K** and **P** have καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον—f. 6^v-8^v; C^a up to ἀλλ' ὥρα λοιπὸν ἐπ' αὐτὴν τῶν ἐδαφίων ἐλθεῖν ἐξέτασιν f. 8^v. This order avoids the disturbance and conflicts we found in examining **V** and **R** and seems to be reasonable if it is looked upon from outside and reviewed superficially.

Every column of the apparatus criticus shows that the two manuscripts **K** and **P** must be formed into one group with **a** **K P a** (= Ambr. A 175 sup.) to which I have referred several times. This group stands strictly apart from the rest of the manuscripts. How about its authority for the text of B? 112, 2 ff. we are told that, after Smyrna was destroyed by an earthquake, Aristeides composed a discourse (λόγον, it is rather some kind of open letter) περὶ αὐτῆς τῆς πτώσεως **A M V p**: περὶ τῆς πτώσεως αὐτῆς **K P a** with no less correct word order; the grammatically most correct order περὶ τῆς αὐτῆς πτώσεως which occurs in **R I** certainly was not used by the writer because it could have a confusing effect (ὁ αὐτός = the same). Since it is hard to say on the basis of this passage alone whether or not we shall have to decide in favor of **K P a**, we must search for other criteria. They must be taken from passages in which the correct order was disturbed in some of the manuscripts. How about the group **K P a** in such cases? There is for example 116, 3 ἐπιγενόμενος δὲ Νέρων ὁ βασιλεὺς τότε πάσης ἀσελγείας μεστός. **K P a** placing τότε after ἐπιγενόμενος δὲ change the sense of the passage completely. This change of word order gains force if we become aware that the group **K P a** sometimes presents variants which were not adopted by any other manuscript or group of manuscripts and seem to be due to sheer caprice, the reasons for

[1]) In Dindorf's edition 742, 8.

which can be easily found in most cases. Aristeides directed the open letter mentioned above 112, 3 f. πρὸς τὸν 'Αντωνῖνον βασιλεύοντα 'Ρωμαίων τότε· ὅντινα ἀναγνοὺς 'Αντωνῖνος. The three manuscripts of the group in question are the only ones that omit 'Ρωμαίων τότε, perhaps because the range of that characterization was not wide enough in the opinion of the redactor of the text. The consequence of this omission is that the participle βασιλεύοντα became unusable and had to be changed to βασιλέα which was placed before the proper name. The generalizing relative pronoun ὅντινα which here, according to late Greek usage, [1]) has no special bearing was replaced by the simple relative pronoun ὃν and the subject 'Αντωνῖνος was placed before the participle ἀναγνούς: in other words, this is a typical case of simplifying and normalizing a passage, the original diction of which is more elegant. 113, 6 f. ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀπήντησα, διότι ἐγὼ οὐ δέομαι ὧν οἱ ἄλλοι δέονται: διὰ τοῦτο . . διότι **A M l p**. Here διότι has no longer its specific shade and has adopted the meaning of ὅτι. In spite of the preceding διὰ τοῦτο there is no reason for being shocked by this usage in so late an author, and it is not necessary to accept the normalization ὅτι which we have in the oldest manuscripts **R V**; **K P a**, however, do not content themselves with making this relatively slight alteration but replace the original διότι ἐγὼ by ἐπειδή. It is much more difficult to decide on οἱ ἄλλοι which follows immediately. Here the three old manuscripts **M R V** agree against the two groups **K P a** and **A l p** which have οἱ πολλοί. It cannot be denied that οἱ πολλοί seems to express more pointedly the feeling of Aristeides who is introduced as speaker. He is disgusted with the behavior of the crowd which haunts the doors of the emperor, hoping to have petty advantages, and places himself in contrast with οἱ πολλοί. The author goes on, however: when the emperor (ὁ δὲ βασιλεύς: καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς **K P a** with a slight alteration only, but it is an alteration anyway) heard that, he gave more to him than to the others. The words τῶν ἄλλων seem to presuppose that οἱ ἄλλοι was used also in the preceding sentence, and it is less probable that τῶν ἄλλων in the second sentence is the source from which the original οἱ πολλοί was changed or assimilated to the following words. In a case like this in which both variants make sense and

[1]) The same usage occasionally occurs also in the scholia on Aristeides.

are almost equally good we must apply, for methodical reasons, to the consensus of the three old manuscripts as higher authority. On the other hand, however, we must bear in mind that the consensus of the two other groups may indicate that οἱ πολλοί is an early variant which deserves to be taken very seriously. The next two cases, however, are simple and unmistakably clear. In 113, 9 f. τοῦ δὲ Μάρκου ἐπιφοιτήσαντος ταῖς Ἀθήναις the compound verb was replaced by the simple φοιτήσαντος in **K P a**, the dative ταῖς Ἀθήναις, however, was not changed.[1] 113, 11 the three manuscripts add before ἐξέπληξεν the pseudo-explanation πάντας although five lines after the same verb is used in the same absolute way and in the same meaning. These cases admonish scepticism against particular variants of this group[2] unless they are supported by other manuscripts of higher authority or recommend themselves by internal evidence. To return to the passage 112, 2 ff. from which I started on p. 47, after all these considerations there is no important reason for rejecting the variant of **A M V p** περὶ αὐτῆς τῆς πτώσεως.

Consensus of the group **K P a** *with other manuscripts*

The situation becomes different if the group **K P a** agrees with one or several other manuscripts. Such a consensus forms the basis for two alternatives. The first is that the variant concerned is correct—this case need not be illustrated by any example—the second includes cases in which a final decision is very difficult or even impossible. Since the text, being constantly used by professors and students of rhetoric, was subject to alterations, it is not surprising that the number of the cases involved is considerable. 112, 8 f.: Aristeides is said to have suffered from serious disease, καὶ τὸ τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦτο ἠργηκέναι ἐπί τινα χρόνον: καὶ τὸ τῶν **M V**: καὶ τὰ τῶν **A p** and **K P a**: κατὰ τὸν λόγον **R l** helps in neither respect: the immediate and necessary consequence of the confusion between καὶ and κατὰ, one of the most common confusions in Greek minuscules, was the change of the genitive to the accusative. It is

[1]) B 112, 1 ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκεῖσε φοιτᾶν τῷ Πολέμωνι τῷ διδασκάλῳ does not furnish a usable parallel.

[2]) It is without any importance that some of these variants found entrance into more recent manuscripts of the late 14th and 15th century.

therefore impossible to say which group is supported by **R l**. The plural is more in accordance with the normal usage and the singular seems to be something like a lectio difficilior. This view is confirmed by the Paris. graec. 2952 in which after τὸ τῶν λόγων the explanation σθένος is added. Under these circumstances the pro et con is almost equal with a very slight superiority on the side of **M V**. No less doubtful is 115, 5: Aristeides is said to have discussed in the first section of the Panathenaicus τὰ πρότερα ὧν ἱστόρησεν Ἡρόδοτος (3). 5 ff. the different subjects are listed but this time they are called τὰ πρῶτα ὧν ἱστόρησεν Ἡρόδοτος if we follow **KPa** and **A V**, τὰ πρότερα, however, again if we pay heed to **M R l p**. Was the second expression assimilated to the previous, or did the writer use the same expression in both passages deliberately? I must confess that I do not see any possibility of a clear decision. It must be said, however, first that the superlative which is used in the sense of the comparative seems to be the lectio difficiiior whereby it becomes less probable that the superlative was introduced later on by an "interpolator" who was displeased with the two successive comparatives used by the author, and secondly that the same usage occurs in the scholia on Aristeides with no variant at all. If both B and the scholia go back to the same source, i.e. Sopater's lectures on and interpretations of Aristeides and to his notes, it seems somewhat hazardous to reject in one place what we recognize in the other. These general considerations speak a little more in favor of the superlative having been used by the author himself. 115, 10 ἐπειδὴ (ἐπεὶ **V** with a very common variant) δὲ λέγουσί τινες **R V** and **K P a**: τινες λέγουσι **A M p**. Either variant seems to be acceptable. The study of the usage of scholiasts and writers of exegetical treatises shows, however, that in interpreting some passage by listing the views of some previous interpreters they are fond of emphasizing the indefinite pronoun which is the subject of the sentence placing it before the predicate despite its being enclitic. A good example of this usage is furnished by Schol. Aristeid. Panath. III 196, 33 Dind. τὸν λόγον εἰς τρία μέρη τινὲς διαιροῦσιν. [1]) This parallel supports the decision in favor of **A M l p** and against **R V + K P a**. The consensus of two groups, one of

[1]) See my *Untersuchungen zu den Aristeidesscholien 107 f.*

which is **K P a**, against a third group is, however, not without value, even if we cannot follow them, because this grouping compels us to examine the passage much more closely than we should in the case of a separate variant of **K P a**.

There is still another interesting case that stands apart (117, 1). The iambic trimeter about Nero, Orestes and Alcmaeon, which is put into the mouth of Pythia, is missing in **K P**, it was, however, supplemented by **P**[2] and was not omitted at all in **a**. **a** and **P**[2] are the only manuscripts that have at the end of the verse the plural μητροκτόνοι which we expect, whereas the rest of the manuscripts, probably including **M** in which the last letter looks more like σ than ι, has the puzzling singular μητροκτόνος. I do not see any possibility to explain the singular, unless the quotation is incomplete and the dictum originally was longer. If this proves true the singular did not belong to the same verse as the three proper names but to the following or to the next to the following, and between the names and μητροκτόνος either 1/3 + 2/3 or 1/3 + 1 + 2/3 of iambic trimeters are missing. [1]) The seemingly plausible explanation that the mistake originated in the common confusion between small σ and ι is inadequate because the singular appears also in the Vatican

[1]) It would not be too difficult to supplement the content of the lost verses out of Lucian's Nero 10. Here it reads as follows: καίτοι τοῦ Πυθίου καταλέξαντος αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς Ὀρέστας τε καὶ Ἀλκμαίωνας, οἷς τὸ μητροκτονῆσαι καὶ λόγον τινὰ εὐκλείας ἔδωκεν, ἐπειδὴ πατράσιν ἐτιμώρησαν. ὁ δὲ μηδαμῶς εἰπεῖν ἔχων ὅτῳ ἐτιμώρησεν ὑβρίσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ᾤετο πρᾳότερα τῶν ἀληθῶν ἀκούων. Since Lucian emphasizes that Nero was told by the god something that was short of the truth and softer, we must assume that the original dictum was longer and had a special point like this: Although Nero, Orestes and Alcmaeon are listed together, this coordination is but restrictedly correct, inasmuch as the two heroes of the myth revenged their fathers killing their mothers, Nero, however, is nothing but matricide. This sounds like an epigram. When this epigram was used to serve as basis for the oracle, it was abridged and received its present shape which we have in Dio Cassius and B. In the new redaction only the plural μητροκτόνοι makes sense. The man, however, who introduced the singular into the text of the two manuscripts of P had still some knowledge of the original dictum. In his sense we must, therefore, understand "Nero, Orestes and Alcmaeon and so on up to μητροκτόνος", but not in the sense of the author of B who adopted the same version of the story as Lucian, with the difference, however, that Lucian makes it clear that the Delphic oracle showed the tendency to soften and to conceal the truth somewhat.

excerpts from Dio Cassius LXI, 16, 2[2]. Although we cannot define the source from which **P**² took the trimeter and we, therefore, do better to eliminate the manuscript in this case, we cannot deny the possibility that at least one of the three representatives of the group, **a**, has preserved a variant which is based on tradition instead of on conjecture.

Result

Even if we set aside the doubtful cases which we have just discussed, the result which we reach for the text of B is the same as for H_1: in both treatises the eclectic method is the only one that helps. The opportunity to form at least three manuscripts (**K P a**) into one group which is characteristically different from the other manuscripts, and to find some rudimentary elements of groups in the other manuscripts in which contamination reached an advanced stage, obliterating the border line between the groups, is a valuable asset for the editor.

Title

In most of the manuscripts headings precede the text of B. Do they pertain solely to the content of the section which follows immediately, or do they also include references to the rest of P? We must compare their different redactions, without listing, however, slight and unimportant variations, to find out whether or not they reveal any definite intentions of their authors. **M** and **K** speaking of Προλεγόμενα content themselves with giving a general title which refers to B and C as well. B is the first section in both manuscripts, in **M** there follow C and, after a new heading, Pan. **K**, however, has the entire collection P, as I have shown on p. 47, but inserts a new heading before Pan. **A R** [1]) **p** use the general term Προλεγόμενα too but specify it by the distinctive addition περί τε βίου καὶ τῆς λόγου τέχνης which evidently embraces B and C. This designation suggests that we consider B and C two consecutive treatises in the same way as it has appeared for T and E (p. 46). It also results from this comparison that the more general title

[1]) We have seen on p. 46 that B starts in **R** not until f. 5r and that Pan. and T alternately written by **R** and **r** were placed before B.

Προλεγόμενα in **M K** must be interpreted differently; otherwise Pan. could not have its special title Προλεγόμενα τοῦ Παναθηναϊκοῦ which appears also in **A**. The titles which are used in **V l** and **a**, however, do not refer to C but exclusively to B. Although **a** belongs to the same group as **K** so far as the text is concerned (see p. 47), it is at least 150 years younger than **K**. The same is true of **l**, and in the third manuscript **V** the matter has become completely different, not only because C was separated from B and placed at the beginning of the manuscript but because H_1 was intercalated between C and B (see p. 43 f.) either by fault of the original copyist or of the more recent restorer of the manuscript in the 15th century. If this striking divergence of titles is more than fortuitous, and I think that it is, we must infer that the titles in the three manuscripts **V a l** must be eliminated as secondary features.

Analysis of B

The "biography" of Aristeides is composed of heterogeneous elements. In the introduction (III, 2-12) the author distinguishes between three generations of orators. The first and the second of them center in Athens, the third, however, by the favor of Τύχη, was given as a present to Asia (ἡ Τύχη δωρεῖται). Does this strange expression indicate that also the author was a native of Asia proud of his part of the world being selected by the grace of destiny to bring forth a whole generation of praiseworthy men? The first generation of orators—he goes on—usually spoke to their audience without the help of any prepared manuscript. The most outstanding representatives were Themistocles, Pericles καὶ οἱ κατ' ἐκείνους ῥήτορες. This vague term "the contemporary rhetoricians" may mean men like Miltiades and Cimon. If we are free to interpret it in this way we have at the very beginning of P an implicit reference to one of those two discourses of Aristeides in which the author is mostly interested; the other one is the Panathenaicus. It is, however, no less possible that the author meant Gorgias and Thrasymachus. The second generation of orators, which, in contrast with the previous, had become used to base their discourses upon prepared manuscripts is represented by Demosthenes, Aeschines, Isocrates καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς ἡ πραττομένη τῶν ῥητόρων δεκάς. This term is somewhat

strange since the three orators who are referred to particularly are included among the so called δεκάς. It rather means "and the rest of orators who have been formed together with the three others into the group of the πραττομένη δεκάς." Since the technical term ἡ πραττομένη δεκάς was too well known to be misinterpreted and current among the circles of rhetoricians and readers who were interested in rhetoric, it is easy to understand and excusable that the author used it even against the rules of strict logic. To the third generation, the Asiatic generation—he repeats emphatically—belonged Polemo, Herodes and Aristeides. This survey is impressively concluded by a brief praise of the honest character of Aristeides who is called πάνυ ἐλλόγιμος, σώφρων λίαν καὶ χρημάτων [1]) κρείττων. His generosity and magnanimity in financial affairs are illustrated by the description of the conversation with the emperor Antoninus (112, 2 ff.) which will be discussed on p. 59 f.

At the beginning of the main section some details are given about Aristeides' parents and native town. The reference to this place is used as basis for a discussion of the controversial question whether or not he is Smyrnaean and for an account of his successful intervention in behalf of the city of Smyrna on its destruction by an earthquake (111, 13-15; 15-112, 2; 2-6). The statement about the place of his birth contains a difficulty. The author calls the town Hadrianupolis instead of Hadrianutherai (which is referred to by Aristeides himself XLVII 51 and 52 Keil) and calls Aristeides a native of Hadrianupolis τῆς Ἰωνίας. Ἀδριανοὶ γάρ οἱ πολῖται (or πολῖται αὐτῆς **A K P R a l p**) λέγονται. The change from the aorist ἐγένετο to the present tense is no less strange than γάρ. What does the sentence "for the citizens (or inhabitants) are called Ἀδριανοί" mean? It is hardly believable that the author expressed himself in so unintelligible and obscure a manner. Is the passage not in order? The examination must start from the discrepancy of names. As a matter of fact we know that the city of Stratonicea which was located in Lydia changed its name to Hadrianupolis. [2]) This city cannot be referred to by the author. On the other hand we do

[1]) χρηστῶν κρείττων in Dindorf's edition is a mistake; the manuscripts with the exception of V have χρημάτων κρείττων.
[2]) Radet, BCH. XI (1887) 117.

not know that Hadrianutherai had in addition to its characteristic name the more general name "City of Hadrian". No source is available upon which to rely for such an assumption. If one were to postulate it because of the passage of B he would not be able to interpret satisfactorily the causal sentence Ἀδριανοὶ γὰρ etc. Now in the biography of Aristeides by Philostratus (vol. II 86, 23 Kayser) and in the article on Aristeides in the Suda [1]) the native town of Aristeides is referred to as Ἀδριανοί. Modern research has proved [2]) that this is not correct and due to a confusion between the two places. This confusion, however, proves to be helpful for a better understanding of the doubtful passage of B in which the causal sentence in question seems to refer to the name Ἀδριανοί. There are but two possibilities to explain the coexistence of the two names Hadrianupolis and Hadrianoi: the first is to spell the name of the city in two words Ἀδριανοῦ πόλεως instead of one and to understand that he was born in a "Hadrian-city of Ionia", i.e., in a city which had been founded by or was called after Hadrian, "for (γὰρ) its name is Adrianoi." This interpretation has, however, an unpleasant consequence. Since it is hardly probable that οἱ πολῖται λέγονται has the meaning of ἡ πόλις λέγεται, we must infer that the author originally wrote ἡ πόλις λέγεται Ἀδριανοί and that the plural Ἀδριανοί was misinterpreted or not understood at all and became the reason for changing πόλις λέγεται to οἱ πολῖται λέγονται. This interpretation of the obscure sentence of B might gain some support from the strange misspelling οἱ πολῖσαι in the manuscript **l**. May we take it for granted that this form is a combination of πόλις and πολῖται and that it confirms the interpretation? The second possibility is that the author did write Hadrianupolis and fell a victim to a confusion different from that of Philostratus and that some ancient reader who had knowledge of the same tradition which was also used by Philostratus and the Suda made a brief marginal comment like this: "the city is called Adrianoi." When

[1]) I think that, after the important papers of P. Maas, *Der Titel des Suidas*, BZ. XXXII (1932) 1 and F. Dölger, *Der Titel des sogenannten Suidaslexikons*, SBBayerAk. 1936, 6 the name "Suidas" should be eliminated definitively.

[2]) See A. Boulanger, *Aelius Aristide et la sophistique*, etc. (Paris 1923) 111 f., n. 2.

the text was copied again the marginal "scholion" was considered to belong to the text and inserted in it in its present form.

To whom the author refers saying that τινὲς call Aristeides Smyrnaean (111, 15) we are unable to determine. The only thing we can say is that, to some extent, the view of these τινὲς is supported by the 11th century [1]) rhetorician John of Sicily who also refers to Aristeides as Smyrnaean. Although in the scholia Sopater is fond of the indefinite pronoun τινὲς for criticizing his favorite opponent Athanasius, this parallel is much too vague to be applied to B. In any case we should bear in mind that in polemical statements of this type τινὲς usually means but one opponent. He—the author declares—had two reasons for claiming Aristeides for Smyrna: first he was a pupil of Polemo and secondly he bestowed an important benefit upon Smyrna. The author is quite right in saying that both facts—they are historically correct [2])—are no definite proof. The true reason for calling Aristeides Smyrnaean may be a different one. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff pointed out [3]) that the possibility cannot be denied that Aristeides' father Eudaemon had more intimate relations with the city of Smyrna. Philostratus who also reports the active intervention of Aristeides with the emperor in favor of the destroyed city of Smyrna [4]) says that it is no vain boast to call Aristeides founder (or rather rebuilder, οἰκιστής) of Smyrna. He does not call him, however, Smyrnaean. Prior to this story Philostratus relates Aristeides' training in Athens κατὰ τὴν Ἡρώδου ἀκμήν and in Pergamon. The author of B arranges these details differently, inasmuch as starting from the surname Smyrnaean he reports everything that refers to Smyrna successively and adds, at the end of the paragraph, in a supplementary note that Aristeides studied philosophy in Athens (112, 6).

The beginning of the new paragraph (112, 7-15) is clearly marked by the opening words οὗτος δὲ ὁ Ἀριστείδης. The main subject of this paragraph is the serious disease which fell upon Aristeides when

[1]) Cf. F. Lenz, *Herm.* LXVI (1931) 53 f.

[2]) The Suda refers to Polemo in three articles as Aristeides' teacher: s.v. Ἀριστείδης, Γρηγόριος (of Nazianzum) and Πολέμων.

[3]) U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Rhetor Aristeides*, SBBerl. 1925, 334.

[4]) II 87, 10 Kayser.

he was still a youth (νέος ὤν). It prevented him for some time from practising his activity as an orator. With this report Philostratus does not, however, completely agree (II 86, 26 f. Kayser), he even conflicts with it saying: νοσώδης δὲ ἐκ μειρακίου γενόμενος οὐκ ἠμέλησε τοῦ πονεῖν. Then B relates Aristeides' sojourn in Pergamon, his healing and the composition of the Ἱεροὶ λόγοι which Philostratus, disagreeing again, calls (II 86, 29 Kayser) Ἱερὰ βιβλία. [1]) At the end of the paragraph Aristeides is said to have been required by Asclepius to speak at least thirty στίχους every day or if he wished an optionally larger amount of lines. An immense number of his λόγοι is, therefore, current—he goes on. It is not surprising that for the last story no source is referred to. Frommel was right in pointing out in his edition of the Scholia on Aristeides, p. 159, n. 1, that there is no passage in the Ἱεροὶ λόγοι in which Aristeides refers to any such order of the god. The scholiast on Ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς II 155, 14 f., however, reports that Aristeides spoke of it in (one of?) those discourses. The passage of Aristeides in question reads as follows: ἐξαιρεῖται δὲ ἡμᾶς αἰτίας καὶ ὁ πάντα ἄριστος Ἀσκληπιὸς ψῆφον οὐκ ἄτιμον οὐδὲ [2]) αὐτὸς διδοὺς τὰ μὲν ἐν μέτροις, τὰ δὲ οὑτωσὶ πεζῇ. On this passage the scholiast comments in the following way [3]): He (the god) asked him (to eulogize him) not only in prose compositions but to recite in his honor every day thirty verses [4]) or, if he wished to, more than thirty but in no way less, as he testifies himself in the Holy Discourses. The daily amount of thirty στίχοι, in consequence of which, according to B, countless λόγοι of Aristeides are current among the people, was changed by the scholiast to thirty verses as we must infer from the antithesis μὴ μόνον καταλογάδην, ἀλλὰ καὶ τριάκοντα στίχους. This statement seems to be sheer invention of the scholiast whose note is without any value and based on no tradition. Reiske-Dindorf took the scholion from the Oxoniensis which represents the recent redaction of the scholia, the poor quality of which I have discussed in the fifth chapter of my book

[1]) Cf. Keil's edition, vol. II, p. 376.

[2]) Apparently the text is not in order. Keil suggests in a marginal note in his copy that after οὐδὲ there is a lacuna.

[3]) p. 159 Frommel=III 432, 31 ff. Dind.

[4]) τριάκοντα στίχους is the correct reading oft he manuscripts; στίχων in Dindorf's edition is without any authority.

mentioned above. This classification of the scholion is confirmed by its appearance in the two 15th century manuscripts Laur. 60, 9 and Marc. graec. 425. Like most of the other more recent Sopater scholia, unless they limit themselves to varying the older scholia, this one too seems to be a Byzantine fiction. I am, however, inclined to consider the possibility that its author had some knowledge of B but made a bad excerpt of it. In so doing he may have remembered the passage of Aristeides' second Holy Discourse XLVIII 3 Keil where it reads as follows: ἐπεὶ μυριάδας γε ἐπῶν οὐκ ἔλαττον ἢ τριάκοντα ἡγοῦμαι τῆς ἀπογραφῆς εἶναι. Since it seems less probable that the author of B using this passage without specific reference and the scholiast misinterpreted the unmistakably clear words of Aristeides so badly or misused them deliberately, we shall rather assume that both remembered some passage of Aristeides in which he had spoken of "thirty" in connection with words or verses or sentences and that they, depending on memory, by which this time they were misled, did not take pains to verify the passage.

The words of the scholion quoted above enable us to complete our survey of the conditions of the text of B. The text of the manuscript of B which was used by the Byzantine author of the scholion was a product of the same process of contamination as the manuscripts which have come down to us: the word order of the scholion τριάκοντα στίχους λέγειν appears in B only in the manuscript **A** instead of τριάκοντα λέγειν στίχους, on the other hand ἐλάττονας δὲ οὐδαμῶς seems to presuppose not ἧττον δὲ οὔ (**A K P a**) but ἥττονας δὲ οὔ (**M R V l p**).

The next paragraph of B which covers 113, 1-114, 3 contains a report on two meetings of Aristeides with the emperors Antoninus and Marcus. The first took place in Smyrna (113, 1-9), the second in Athens (113, 9-114, 3). Aristeides did his utmost to elude Antoninus because he wished to avoid the suspicion that he was trying to take the opportunity to gain some personal advantage, although he was quite disinterested, whereas other people haunted the doors of the emperor. When Antoninus sent for him he gave as reason for his not coming voluntarily: οὐ δέομαι ὧν οἱ ἄλλοι δέονται, ἀντὶ τοῦ χρημάτων (6 f.). The explanation introduced by ἀντὶ sounds very awkward and looks almost like a marginal addition which

was not written by the author but made by some reader and later on taken into the text. There is, however, no decisive reason for eliminating it. This kind of explanatory addition completely agrees with the manner of scholiasts. It is, therefore, not surprising that strikingly similar cases recur in long and valuable Sopater scholia of descriptive or narrative character, and it appears again that the ultimate source of P and the scholia as well is not a deliberate composition but the ex tempore words of a professor teaching students. In lectures which are not delivered for the purpose of immediate publication such explanations are quite natural and usual.

The author relates this story because he wishes to show that Aristeides was absolutely without interest in making money at any rate. This statement about Aristeides' character looks back without direct reference to the previous passage III, 11 where Aristeides is characterized as χρημάτων κρείττων (see p. 54). When Aristeides meets the emperor Marcus he criticizes in the conversation with the ruler the sophist Hadrian for his ex tempore talks by which he produces an amazing effect upon the audience: ἡμεῖς τῶν ἐμούντων οὐκ ἐσμέν, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἀκριβούντων. Nevertheless, he also spoke, producing a still greater effect, and was applauded—it goes on. Does that mean that he delivered an ex tempore talk contrary to his inclination? Although this interpretation seems probable it is not correct, for if we compare this version of the story with Philostratus we learn that the author of B skipped an important detail. Philostratus (II 87, 20 ff. Kayser) quoting Damianus of Ephesus as source knows of but one meeting of Aristeides and the emperor Marcus which took place in Smyrna, not in Athens. According to him both events that the author of B arranges separately as happening in Smyrna, where he met Antoninus, and in Athens, where he met Marcus, took place in Smyrna successively at the meeting with Marcus. Instead of the money affair, however, we read something quite different. "I have not seen you up to this moment. What is the reason?"—the emperor asks Aristeides who has no longer succeeded in eluding the emperor. "Because θεώρημα, ὦ βασιλεῦ, ἠσχόλει, γνώμη δὲ θεωροῦσά τι μὴ ἀποκρεμαννύσθω οὗ ζητεῖ." This excuse that he was too busy with

his own thoughts is disregarded by the emperor who goes on asking: "When shall I have the opportunity to listen to you?"—"Tomorrow, today tell me what subject I am supposed to discuss, οὐ γάρ ἐσμεν τῶν ἐμούντων, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἀκριβούντων", that is "I do not belong to the talk-belchers." In this connection the dictum is much more pointed and impressive than in B where we are not told that Aristeides is asked by the emperor to deliver a talk. The other story about the money, however, is well prepared and neatly related in B. In no respect do we gain the impression that the author of B used Philostratus. The story of the conflict between Aristeides and Herodes Atticus and Herodes' defeat which is reported in the next paragraph (114, 4-15) has no parallel at all in Philostratus, nor were the biographical data about Herodes taken from Philostratus' Lives. Although the statement about Herodes' descent ἀπὸ ὑπάτων may be compared with Philostratus II 55 Kayser, the redaction of the story about the great treasure which was uncovered by Herodes and offered to the emperor is quite different in Philostratus, inasmuch as not Herodes nor the emperor Marcus are concerned but Herodes' father and the emperor Nerva.

114, 4 ff. we read that Herodes plotted an unsuccessful intrigue to prevent Aristeides from reciting the Panathenaicus publicly. This story is a prelude to a detailed discussion of that discourse. Consequently the next paragraph (114, 16-115, 9) loses almost entirely its biographical character and becomes something like a ὑπόθεσις τοῦ Παναθηναϊκοῦ. At the beginning it gives some details about title and εἶδος and reasons for Aristeides' delivering the discourse. The author declines, however, to comment upon the details: τὰ δὲ κεφάλαια ἐν τῷ λόγῳ εἰσόμεθα. These words are either a preliminary announcement of Pan. 121 ff. where some κεφάλαια are listed, or they mean "we shall receive (fuller) information in the discourse", i.e. by studying the discourse. Neither interpretation excludes the other. It is the design of the author to read the Panathenaicus with his students after completing the introductory course and to prepare for the reading by a more general introduction. Without overinterpreting this passage we may also say that scholia on the Panathenaicus are going to follow after the discussion of the more general questions comes to an end. In spite of that announ-

cement, also in B the structure of the Panathenaicus is discussed at greater length. It consists of four sections. This statement completely agrees with the view held by Sopater and repeatedly referred to in the scholia. Sopater was in this important question quite of the same opinion as the rhetorician Menander and disagreed as usually with Athanasius. For a detailed interpretation of the scholia in question I refer to my *Untersuchungen zu den Aristeidesscholien, p. 107 f.* and to my supplementary note on B. Keil's paper which I published in the *Herm.* LXXI (1936) 180. The discussion of the question as to how the large material was arranged and formed into four sections and the references to Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon and Theopompus recur in the older Sopater scholia (III 9, 17 ff. Dind.). The general points of view are identical in both passages although some details are expressed differently. It is beyond doubt that both redactions go back to the same author, with the only difference that in B he speaks more directly, in the scholia, however, through the medium of the scholiast who compiles a selection from available larger material collected by the original interpreter. For the sake of briefness I restrict myself to calling attention to but one interesting agreement between B and the scholia: 115, 7 f. τὰ δὲ Θουκυδίδου τὰ Πελοποννησιακά, τὰ δὲ Ξενοφῶντος, αἱ 'Ελληνικαί, and in Schol. III 240, 28—it is one of the older Sopater scholia again—Xenophon's Hellenica are referred to as αἱ Ἑλληνικαί [1]).

The concluding section of B is filled with some stories which the author reports because he does not wish them to be propagated by others uncritically (115, 10-117, 5 and 117, 5-14). Although not all the details are equally intelligible, the course of the arguments does not furnish difficulties. The type of ancient biographies, for which the accumulation of different and separate successive stories and anecdotes is significant, exerted some influence upon the shape of this section of B. The first story runs as follows: Some (τινὲς) are wrong in saying that Galen and Aristeides, in

[1]) It is significant that the feminine was changed to the neuter in the manuscripts Q T which present the older Sopater scholia in an epitomized and, so to speak, more popular shape. The feminine also in Harpocration s.v. ἀναγκαῖον (p. 17, 2 Bekker).

compliance with an oracle, imparted their τέχναι to each other respectively. Does that mean that Galen bestowed the knowledge of medicine upon Aristeides or that he actually helped him, and that Aristeides in turn in order to thank him initiated him into his own art? In any case—the writer declares—the story is unbelievable: First Aristeides nowhere refers to the matter, and secondly, if it happened at all, it did not happen because of an oracle, since at that time the oracle was dumb: it is said to have been silenced τῶν Φωκέων τότε ἐμπρησάντων αὐτό. What does τότε mean? Does it refer to the time of the alleged meeting between Galen and Aristeides? How does the biographer know that τότε the Phocians burned the oracle? This becomes still more confused by the following words ἐπιγενόμενος δὲ Νέρων ὁ βασιλεὺς τότε πάσης ἀσελγείας μεστός. The whole previous interpretation had led again and again to the same result that B must be connected with Sopater's activity. We can hardly imagine that he was so devoid of any knowledge of history that he spoke of an attack of the Phocians upon Delphi or something like that and that he claimed Nero for the second century. There are only two alternatives: either the source of B made some chronological mistake and mixed up the events, and B borrowed the absurd report mechanically. This explanation is at variance with the fact that the emperor concerned is Nero whose lifetime was generally known; or the passage is corrupt. The main difficulty lies in the first τότε. It was either miscopied under the influence of τότε one line below and must be bracketed, or it must be changed to ποτέ. The confusion between τότε and πότε or ποτέ in Greek manuscripts is very common. In both cases we restore a reference to the well known Phocian events at the time of Philip of Macedon. Although this reference is not relevant to the activity of the oracle in the second century A.D., it is not wrong so far as the matter is concerned. Under this presupposition also the obscure ἐπιγενόμενος begins to make some sense. It means: the Phocians were the first to do serious harm to the oracle, later on there came Nero who enlarged and embellished it, but afterwards he changed his mind and silenced it [1]) in revenge for being called

[1]) All the inventions and gossip which were occasioned by Nero's trip to Greece in general and by his sojourn at Delphi in particular are scarcely

matricide by the priestess. Consequently the oracle cannot have given any advice concerning Galen and Aristeides. That is the implicit consequence of the arguments, which must be inferred from the beginning of the story. The whole proof is not very convincing, it was, however, difficult to avoid if the author wished to report and criticize the story.

The answer which Nero receives from Pythia that she must decline to reply to his question because she appreciates greater the simple gift of the humble man with pure heart than the precious present of a powerful and wealthy man who is morally bad, is a genuine product of the spirit of Delphi. It is, however, not necessary to comment on it since many important parallels and references were given in Rudolf Herzog's fine contribution "*Das delphische Orakel als ethischer Preisrichter*" to Ernst Horneffer's book "*Der junge Platon*", Giessen 1921, 151-170 (for B see p. 155).

Similar scepticism is shown by the author concerning the second story which was current about Aristeides. It was reported by his opponents who wished to detract from him as an unqualified and unsuccessful teacher of rhetoric. The author eliminates the whole story as untrue so far as the famous rhetorician Aristeides is concerned, and puts it into relation with an unknown more recent namesake. This explanation was accepted by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, SBBerl. 1925, 347, n. 2. According to Wilamowitz the strange word κυψέλια in the pentameter of the distich (117, 10) is the transformed Latin noun subsellia adapted to Greek. Such an adaptation could not take place until the fourth century A.D.—Wilamowitz adds. [1])

Last sentence of B

After reporting these two stories the author concludes B with a brief sentence of five words. It reads as follows: οὐ πάνυ γηραιὸς

worth discussing at length. The head of Typhon which Nero is said to have thrown against the site of the oracle in order to silence it recalls the myth about Typhon's attack upon Delphi, which is reported by Plut. De fac. orb. lun. 30. 945 B. It is not impossible that this myth served as the source of the invention.

[1]) I am not convinced that the explanation attempted by Wilamowitz hits the mark and I leave to be considered whether κυψέλια should be changed to συμψέλια; cf. Past. Herm. vis. 3. 1. 4 and especially mand. 11.1.

δὲ τέθνηκεν. This little sentence compels us to face a difficult problem. At first sight it means: when Aristeides died he was not yet far beyond the conventional limit of old age, i.e. he was not much older than sixty years. Philostratus (II 89, 30 f. Kayser) is less brief reporting two different versions: some people think that he was sixty years old, others, however, that he was close to seventy. The main difficulty is not furnished by these two or three conflicting statements, it is rather the question as to the right place for this sentence. **M V** and the group **K P a** present it after the second anecdote, in **A R l p** it has, however, its place at the end of C. In the manuscripts C has its normal place after B with the exception of **V** in which C is the first section of P (see p. 43). So far as we have been able to understand from all the previous discussions, the place of the sentence at the end of B seems to be correct and adequate. It is, however, still an open question and remains to be seen whether or not the analysis of C (see p. 66 ff.) will produce the same result. Even without an immediate analysis of C, however, we are scarcely wrong in saying that the same author could not use the same sentence at the end of two successive treatises or sections of one treatise if they were composed one after another. This repetition could be justified under the presupposition that he wrote at first B only and concluded the biography with the statement about the duration of life of Aristeides, but that later on he decided to add C and transferred the last sentence of B to the end of C because he wished to place the statement about the death of his hero at the very end of the enlarged treatise. In this case it would appear that some of the manuscripts which have come down to us go back to an ancient copy which showed the previous stage of Sopater's studies of Aristeides, some, however, to another copy that was composed when his studies had become more comprehensive. Such a construction is unconvincing and need not be taken into serious consideration. There is still another seemingly possible explanation of quite a different kind: it is based upon the assumption that the sentence οὐ πάνυ γηραιὸς δὲ τέθνηκεν is genuine in neither passage but a more recent addition which came into the text at two different places. This hypothesis is worth examining because it seems to be confirmed by Libanius' Life of Demosthenes

in which the death of the orator is not referred to at all. In § 7 (p. 4 of C. Fuhr's Teubner edition of Demosthenes, vol. I) Libanius relates that Demosthenes had to overcome some physical impediments through systematic exercises and adds some illustrating anecdotes. Then he goes on (§ 8): "It is, however, also necessary to cast a glance at the situation in Greece and Athens at that time." He then gives a historical survey down to the period of the rise of Philip of Macedon. Here he stops and goes on (p. 5, 16) without any transition: "There are three fields of rhetoric, the ἐπιδεικτικόν, δικανικόν, συμβουλευτικόν." After this general statement he enters upon an inquiry into the activity of Demosthenes in those three fields and discusses the question of the proper title in the case of his συμβουλευτικοί and Φιλιππικοὶ λόγοι. Here the biography reaches its end and is followed by the ὑποθέσεις of the orations which had been announced at the beginning of the biography (p. 1, 8). There is no report on the further circumstances of Demosthenes' life and his death. Nevertheless this parallel is not conclusive. For two reasons it does not confirm the assumption that the last sentence of B is not genuine and was added later on at the end of B and C respectively. First we shall find quite a similar case of repetition in Te. and C•, where at least once the words involved are undoubtedly genuine, as will appear below (see p. 100). Secondly, besides Libanius' Life of Demosthenes we must cast a glance also at some other ancient biographies. There is, for instance, the Life of Thucydides by the so called Marcellinus. The description of the events concerning the death of Thucydides [1]), which covers no less than four paragraphs (31-34), is prior to an inquiry into the character of the style of Thucydides and his models, which follows immediately (35 ff.) and begins with the words ζηλωτὴς δὲ γέγονεν ὁ Θουκυδίδης. That is an important parallel which illustrates the last sentence of B οὐ πάνυ γηραιὸς δὲ τέθνηκεν and the abrupt beginning of the discussion of Aristeides' style in C. In the γένος καὶ βίος

[1]) The death of Thucydides is discussed again in 45. This doublet is one of the starting points for an inquiry into the question as to the biography being composed of several sections which were written by different grammarians. This question, however interesting it may be, is not important for the comparison with B.

of Sophocles[1]) 14 ff. there are made statements about the poet's death and tomb; in 18-23 without any transition details about the number of his plays, about his competitors, the ἠθοποιία and some certain peculiarities of style are subjoined. Of still greater significance are the so called Plato Prolegomena. After discussing Plato's death in chapter VI (p. 201 Hermann) the author goes on (VII): ἐπειδὴ τὴν ἱστορίαν τοῦ Πλάτωνος μεμαθήκαμεν, φέρε καὶ τὸ εἶδος τῆς αὐτοῦ φιλοσοφίας διηγησώμεθα. This is the best available parallel: the history of Plato's life including his death and the εἶδος of his philosophy. This analogy allows the conclusion that the bi-partition: external circumstances of the life of the author including his death and εἶδος of his subject matter or character of his style or his models is characteristic of that type of ancient biography which serves as introduction to the study of the works of the author or poet in question. If this general result is applied to the special case of the relationship between B and C, it appears again that C cannot be separated from B, that the order B C is correct and that the sentence οὐ πάνυ γηραιὸς δὲ τέθνηκεν must be placed at the end of B with the manuscripts **M V** and **K P a**, but not of C with **A R 1 p**. The question as to the change of its place in these four manuscripts cannot be answered precisely. The most probable explanation is, however, that the change was made by someone who did not understand the structure of B and C and had no knowledge of the schema which the comparison with other biographies has brought into evidence. On the other hand, since B and C were still two sections of one treatise, we can understand that he felt that it was desirable to place the statement about Aristeides' death at its very end. Dindorf, however, was wrong in accepting this arbitrary transposition.

Beginning of C

The examples taken from other biographies are also helpful in another respect, inasmuch as they throw some light upon the beginning of C. Marcellinus concludes the specifically biographic-

[1]) It is not in the Laurentianus. I quote the paragraphs from Pearson's edition.

al section of his Life of Thucydides with the statement that, because of his premature death, he was not in position to write the history of the whole Peloponnesian war according to his original plan (34). The first sentence of the next paragraph in which Thucydides' models and character of style are discussed begins, as I have said on p. 65, with the words ζηλωτὴς δὲ γέγονεν ὁ Θουκυδίδης. The same method is followed by the author of B and C. Aristeides died when he was not yet very old—he says at the end of B—and begins in C with the words περὶ δὲ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος καὶ τῆς ἐν λόγοις 'Αριστείδου φύσεως. If C were to stand apart from B and to be read as an independent treatise, the author would scarcely have begun with the conjunction δὲ which is characteristic of the λέξις εἰρομένη. Now we also understand why C as integral part of B has no special title in the manuscripts, and we see that this lack of title is not due to any chance, but that the manuscripts are absolutely trustworthy in this respect. On p. 52 f. we succeeded in forming the various titles of B in the manuscripts into groups. We are unable to decide whether the general title Προλεγόμενα goes back to the author himself or to an editor. We are able, however, to understand that the second title Προλεγόμενα περί τε βίου καὶ τῆς λόγου τέχνης conflicts with Sopater's own words in which he informs the audience at the beginning of C that he is going to speak περὶ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος καὶ τῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις 'Αριστείδου φύσεως. We shall, therefore, best distrust the specialized title in the manuscripts in general and the singular λόγου in particular. The length of B and C has the striking misproportion of 5 : 1. If we cast a glance at Libanius' Life of Demosthenes we learn that such a misproportion is not exceptional, here it is almost 8 : 1. The reasons are very obvious: first biographical or pseudobiographical material was much easier to collect than topics of an inquiry into the style of an author, and secondly a longer biographical section interwoven with anecdotes was more attractive and interesting also for general readers.

The manuscripts on which the text of C must be based need not be discussed since it now goes without saying that the results reached for B are true also of C. The discussion of one important problem, however, perhaps of the most important one, cannot be

undertaken until C* has been examined, I mean the question as to the relationship between C and its "parallel version" C* (see p. 100 ff.).

C presupposes B

At the beginning of C the author informs the audience or reader of his main purpose. He is going to write περὶ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος [1]) and τῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις 'Αριστείδου φύσεως and adds in parenthesis almost apologizing: "I have failed to discuss these subjects above" (ἐν τοῖς ἄνω). The verb "to fail" (παρήκαμεν) means that he did it deliberately and that in drafting B he conceived also C. Now he refers, therefore, to the preceding section of his treatise. Although C is brief it must be divided into some paragraphs.

Parts of C

(1) 118, 1-5: This paragraph gives a brief summary of the views held by previous critics, of whom Longinus is referred to by name. For its diction an accumulation of adjectives with aesthetical meanings is significant, such as γόνιμος [2]), ἐνθυμηματικός, βίαιος and last of all the most important and most adequate [3]) characterization: καθόλου τὸν Δημοσθένην μιμούμενος.

(2) 118, 6-9: "I wish to supplement these views by some additional remarks." After this introduction a second series of characterizing adjectives follows, such as φιλότιμος, χαίρων καιναῖς ὑποθέσεσιν, πρὸς τοὺς πρώτους τῶν παλαιῶν μαχόμενος. The most eminent men of previous eras, with whom Aristeides is supposed to vie, are listed in inverted chronological order: Isocrates, Demosthenes, Thucydides, and Herodotus. Plato who is no less important in this respect stands apart. In any case we understand from this list of names that Sopater does not refer to any special discourse but gives a more comprehensive description writing general Prolegomena; the treatise Pan. which centers around the contrast between Aristeides and Isocrates only is a feature of quite the opposite type.

[1]) Cf. A. Körte, *Herm.* LXIV (1929) 69-86.
[2]) Cf. Ernesti, *Lexicon technologiae Graecorum rhetoricae*, p. 65.
[3]) Cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, SBBerl. 1925, 336.

(3) 118, 9-12: The beginning of the new paragraph is marked by οὗτος οὖν which must be compared with the similar case B 112, 7 (p. 56). The manner of writing changes, inasmuch as the series of the characterizing adjectives (see (1) and (2)) is not continued; they are rather replaced by verbs (πλέκει, τίθησι, δημοσθενίζει, μάχεται) and verbs and nouns (σχημάτων ἀγωνιστικῶν εὑρετὴς γεγένηται). [1])

(4) 118, 9-119, 6: The design of the concluding paragraph is different. Sopater wishes to emphasize the difference between Aristeides and the rest of the sophists. His ingenuity is far superior to their standard and places him on a much higher level. Putting main stress on the νοεῖν instead of on the λέξις he alone was able to imitate in a true and not perfunctory manner what "we have recognized" (κατενοήσαμεν) as Demosthenes' specific achievement. Aristeides does not grant any rest to the νοῦς (οὐκ ἀναπαύει) and turns it around (κινῶν **R l**: νικῶν with a very common confusion the rest of the manuscripts), that is: he varies it incessantly until all the possibilities of expressing his thought are exhausted. The words ὃ γὰρ ὡς ἴδιον Δημοσθένει προσὸν κατενοήσαμεν strikingly resemble one of the older Sopater scholia on the Panathenaicus (III 44, 23 D.), with which they have never been compared so far as I know, and are just as capable of various interpretations [2]) as the decisive words in the scholion ὡς ἔγνωμεν ἐν τῷ Περὶ στεφάνου. They mean either that Sopater, prior to introducing his students to the works of Aristeides, gave a similar course on Demosthenes, or that, prior to writing down his ideas about Aristeides' character of style, he wrote a corresponding treatise on Demosthenes and takes it now for granted that it is familiar to the audience.

The beginning of this paragraph suffers from a corruption which seems to be very old. If we base the passage upon Dindorf's text including the variant readings he knew, the meaning seems to be something like this: as a master (or: ruler) he comes to ‹all places of› the earth (or: he subjugates the whole earth) carrying along from Asia nothing empty, light or foolish. The three adjectives

[1]) The text in Dindorf's edition makes no sense and must be corrected with the help of C[a] which was unknown to Dindorf.

[2]) See my *Untersuchungen zu den Aristeidesscholien*, p. 103.

κενόν, κοῦφον and εὔηθες are characteristic of the author's contemptuous attitude toward so called Asianism which did not produce any unfavorable effect upon Aristeides. These last words are simple and lucid. The idea, however, that Aristeides travels through all the countries of the earth as a κύριος ἀσφαλής or ἀσφαλῶς [1]) ὡς κύριος is strange in itself and seems still more puzzling if we look in those manuscripts which were not used by Dindorf. The noun γῆν has its place after the article τὴν in **A R V l p** but in **M** δὲ has been inserted in between and after γῆν follows without any connection the noun γνώμην. Finally, **P** was uncertain whether he should write τὴν or γῆν. At first he decided for τὴν and added δὲ, which we have also in **M**, but later on he changed his mind and corrected τὴν to γῆν. Then there is a free space which was either left by the scribe or later restored by him or by the second hand which erased some previous word. It is impossible to make a decision with the help of the photostat only. In any case, however, it is the second hand which added the words γῆν δὲ πᾶσαν. If we take into account that both ἀσφαλής and κύριος are used by authors to characterize orators [2]), we feel tempted to think that not only at the end of the sentence but also at its beginning Aristeides' style had been described by the author. Whether he called Aristeides πᾶσαν γνώμην κύριος ἀσφαλής or in other words: whether γνώμην [3]) in **M** is right—in this case the corrupt form γῆν, upon the origin of which the article τὴν might have exerted some influence, [4]) would precede the correct one—remains an undecided question and is not very probable for two reasons: first ὡς after ἀσφαλής seems to indicate that some comparison is going to follow, unless it originates in an attempt to correct ἀσφαλής to ἀσφαλῶς and was transcribed by misinterpretation as ὡς, and secondly the word which follows immediately in the manuscripts is so dubious and uncertain—we have ἐρχόμενος **A**: ἐπερχόμενος **V**: διερχόμενος **p**: ἐχόμενος **R l**: ἀρχόμενος **M**:

[1]) ἀσφαλῶς was changed by Dindorf to ἀσφαλής.

[2]) They are quite compatible with each other, ἀσφαλής meaning "convincing" (Xen., Mem. IV 6, 15) and κύριος "powerful" or "impressive"; the connotations of κυρία λέξις or κυριολογία must be eliminated, however.

[3]) γνώμη = sense, bearing, content. Philostratus, Imag. I 1 speaks of γνώμη τῆς 'Ιλιάδος.

[4]) See above the discussion of the variant in **P**.

ἀρχὴν δὲ with some corrections **P**—that all these variant readings look like unsuccessful attempts to remove a deeper corruption of the original text which read quite differently. In this survey I have deliberately made no use of the two manuscripts **K a**. As we have seen again and again, we have little reason for trusting them if their variant readings stand apart. In the present case they differ from the rest of the manuscripts and from each other as well. Both of them have κύριος ἀσφαλής and, instead of ἐρχόμενος etc., ἀρχαῖος, that is to say a third adjective significant for the style, which is not inadequate and may be hidden also in ἀρχόμενος. Under no circumstances, however, are they trustworthy in substituting λέξιν for γῆν or γνώμην and going on after ἀρχαῖος: σαφὴς οὐδὲν ἐκ τῆς 'Ασιάδος εὕρατο καινόν (instead of κενόν) **a** and σαφὴς οὐδὲν ἐκ τῆς 'Ασιάδος ἔχων ὑπόκενον **K**. These variant readings are very interesting and easy to explain. **K** took it literally from C^a, and **a** agrees with C^a up to 'Ασιάδος. The expression ἔχων ὑπόκενον is in C^a doubtless right. It appears, however, nowhere in the original text of C except for **K** whose scribe or redactor is very fond of admitting arbitrary changes or interpolations. We have, therefore, every reason for suspecting that the copyist of **K** tried to remove the corruption interpolating C out of C^a. We must, therefore infer that the original expression in C was far from being identical with the text of C^a.[1]) If ὡς which appears in the three groups **M P**, **A V** and **R l p** and γῆν are correct, a comparison is being introduced by which Aristeides is likened to a master (κύριος) who, coming from Asia, <·>—all over the world, or to, or against, the whole world—indicates that some verb of motion is missing. We restore that verb accepting ἐπερχόμενος which is presented by **V**. Thereby he is said to have taken the field against the whole world like a ruler who did not fall, who never lost a battle and carried along[2]) no worthless and futile things. This concept appears to receive its specific meaning if Aristeides is compared by the author to a real ruler (κύριος is a very significant term) who came from

[1]) The relations between C and C^a will be discussed in a more detailed manner on p. 100 ff.

[2]) ἐπεσύρατο **A R l p**: εὕρατο **M P V a** was apparently corrupted out of (ἐπ)εσύρατο; ἐπεφέρετο Vat. graec. 935 is a mere interpretation of ἐπεσύρατο; for ἔχων **K** see above in the text.

Asia to conquer the world taking along many useless things in a very frivolous and stupid manner and failed miserably. The reference is clear enough for every reader who was familiar with Herodotus' report on Xerxes' expedition against Greece and the king's behavior. It is true that the comparison of the victorious conqueror Aristeides with the defeated conqueror Xerxes is very extravagant and comes close to being absurd. Whether we accept this interpretation of the sentence as a comparison or prefer to content ourselves with assuming an early deep corruption of the text, in both cases it appears that in C^a almost no trace of it is left.

There is still another small but significant difference between C and C^a. In C we have 118, 13 ἐκ τῆς 'Ασίας, in C^a, however, ἐκ τῆς 'Ασιάδος which was changed in some manuscripts to 'Ασίας. In C^a which centers around questions of diction the form 'Ασιάδος is much more appropriate because it implies the idea of the so called Asiatic diction, whereas in C a term was needed which had the denotation of a certain type of style and the connotation of a part of the world. The usual Greek term is 'Ασιανὸς ζῆλος (e.g. Strab. XIV 648 and Plut. Ant. 2) and 'Ασιάς is the current feminine form. [1])

III.

Pan.

A. Boulanger in his book on Aristeides mentioned above (p. 456, n. 3) denies that there are any sufficient reasons for attributing Pan. to Sopater. Nevertheless more than 100 years ago W. Frommel in his edition of the scholia on Aristeides called attention to some cases of agreement between Pan. and the scholia, which cannot be overlooked. In addition to these cases it will appear later on (see p. 92) that in Te. of which Sopater claims the authorship for himself he refers to Pan. so unmistakably that we must consider his words a direct quotation from his previous treatise. The analysis of Pan. which we are going to attempt has a twofold task: we must fix our attention not only upon the congruence with some older Sopater scholia referred to by Frommel but we must raise the question as to its relations to the rest of P or even H_1.

[1]) For the concluding sentence in Dindorf's edition see p. 63 ff.

Although the title of the discourse is Panathenaicus—the author begins—its technique is at variance with the title, inasmuch as it disregards completely the Panathenaic festival, the actual reason for the discourse. The subject is rather τὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐγκώμιον in general. Aristeides has shown no interest in the special requirements of the actual πανήγυρις but strictly observes the rules which were established for the literary γένος of encomium. That is why the θέσις τῆς χώρας is described—ἔκφρασις is its technical name—and why the κάλλη τῆς γῆς are praised throughout from the point of view of αὔξησις. Led by pedagogical and didactic purposes (πρὸς ἄσκησιν τοῖς νέοις) and competing with Isocrates he sets forth at greater length the historical events and is not concerned in praising the actual festival—the author declares again (121, 2-11). The term αὔξησις and the name of Isocrates are the key-words for the main section which centers in a comparison between Aristeides and Isocrates. Both of them chose the title Panathenaicus because they wished to emphasize τὸ πάντων ὁμοῦ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐγκώμιον as central idea of the discourses. That is the starting point for those τινὲς who have objections to the method followed by Aristeides. With reference to Isocrates, Busiris 4 they [1]) criticize Aristeides for making an important mistake. If one wishes to praise someone—they say—he must magnify the virtues of his hero, just as a prosecutor must do quite the opposite about the vices and crimes of the man whom he accuses. Aristeides, however, speaking of wrongs committed by the Athenians against the island of Melos and the city of Scione played the part of an accuser instead of an encomiast (121, 11-122, 7). The same critics of Aristeides are referred to in the older Sopater scholion III 286, 9 D. This scholion comments upon the first words of the paragraph in which the incidents of Melos and Scione are discussed. It begins: διαβάλλουσί τινες τὸν Ἀριστείδην διὰ ταύτην τὴν ἀντίθεσιν and defines the encomium as αὔξησις τῶν προσόντων ἀγαθῶν. In Pan. 121, 18 we read: ἃ δέ τινες περὶ τῶν ἀντιθέσεων ἐγκαλοῦσι τῷ σοφιστῇ, and

[1]) The manuscripts have φασὶν and φησὶν. Either is justifiable. From the grammatical point of view we need the plural in conformity to τινὲς. If this indefinite pronoun, however, means, as it usually does, but one certain man with whom the author disagrees, the singular is no less correct. It is impossible to make a decision.

immediately after the task of the encomiast is defined again: πλείω τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῖς ἀγαθῶν τὰ προσόντα ἀποφαίνειν. I still refrain from drawing any conclusion from this striking congruence. The critique of Aristeides cannot be taken without a refutation or "solution" (λύσις)—the author goes on. Two refutations are possible, one of them is more general, the other more special. The first is that an encomiast should not exclude what looks like an indictment, provided he is able to point out that it is not so in fact. The more special λύσις is the following: some of the encomia are ἄγαν ἔνδοξα καὶ ὁμολογούμενα ἀγαθά, the rest of them are ἀμφίδοξα, that means, those are devoted to persons whose reputation, or to events whose importance is undisputed because they belong to the generally recognized ἀγαθά, these to such people or happenings about which recognition and critique are equally possible. The first group is formed by the encomia of gods and rulers, the second by the encomia of less distinguished men whose deeds either [1]) deserve to be praised without restriction or provoke doubts in the mind of their interpreter. If the encomiast wishes to change the κατὰ φύσιν ἀμφίδοξα to ἔνδοξα, he must first magnify τὰ ὁμολογούμενα ἀγαθά, secondly he must be able to persuade that the μέσα are not μέσα but ἔνδοξα, and thirdly he must change the character of facts or deeds which, instead of giving potential reasons for διαβολή and κατηγορία, must become reasons for praising the man to whom the encomium is devoted. This technique was cultivated by Demosthenes and adopted by Aristeides in his account of the deeds of Athens. He magnified the ὁμολογούμενα ἀγαθά, such as the gifts which were bestowed upon the city by the gods and the magnanimity of the Athenians who gladly gave an asylum [2]) to refugees from foreign countries, and by skilful manipulations he threw a favorable light upon the μέσα, such as wars and the

[1]) πῇ μὲν· πῇ δὲ: the same disjunctive conjunction recurs in T 140, 11 f. where Dindorf, however, is wrong in writing πού. T undoubtedly belongs to Sopater. In connection with the more important arguments discussed in the text this slight agreement gains significance and is scarcely accidental; cf. also p. 76, n. 1 and 77, n 1.

[2]) The variant ὑποδοχὰς is not only guaranteed by the reliable manuscripts but is in full harmony with many passages of the Panathenaicus and the scholia as well; εὐχὰς which was accepted by Dindorf must be rejected (123, 11).

like. [1]) Finally he "dissolved" deeds that seemed to be defamatory to the Athenians, for example the two cases of Melos and Scione, contrasting them with adequate ἀντιθέσεις to the effect that the person praised, in this special case the Athenians, appears to be ἔνδοξον (122, 7-124, 2). Quite the same arguments are used in the scholion mentioned above (p. 73), with the only difference that various theories are considered whether or not and how far objectionable deeds or happenings which may cause displeasure (τὰ λυπηρά) to the audience deserve a place in encomia in which private people or whole communities are eulogized. On the same passage of the Panathenaicus another scholion comments which has not received its correct place in Dindorf's edition (III 283, 35-284, 6). It is still closer to Pan. I restrict myself to quoting the most significant words: τῶν προσόντων ἀγαθῶν ἢ προσώπῳ ἢ πράγματι τὰ μέν ἐστιν ὁμολογούμενα, τὰ δὲ ἀμφισβητούμενα (~ ἀμφίδοξα Pan.) . . . λύσομεν φανερῶς θέντες τὴν (v: omitted in **M A**) [2]) περὶ αὐτῶν ἀντίθεσιν ~ Pan. 124, 2 f. κἂν τῇ θέσει τῆς ἀντιθέσεως. These similarities suggest that, to speak cautiously, the two Sopater scholia and Pan. are not very far apart. Now in H_1 which also must be connected with Sopater, as the analysis has made clear, it is Sopater's design to prove that the discourse Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων does not belong to the εἶδος ἐγκωμιαστικόν. Here it reads as follows (159, 7 ff.) οὐδὲ γὰρ ὡς ὁμολογουμένων ἀγαθῶν ποιεῖται τὴν αὔξησιν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς λύσιν τῶν δοκούντων ἐγκλημάτων ..... ὁ Ἀριστείδης εἴληφε τὰ ἐγκώμια. The best possible explanation of this argument is offered by the two scholia and Pan. as well. Also on the concluding section of Pan. which I have not as yet taken into consideration light is thrown by the end of the first of the two scholia.

The θέσις of the ἀντίθεσις—the author goes on—enabled Aristeides to master the difficulties which might arise from the references to Melos and Scione (123, 13 ff.). That Aristeides borrowed this tech-

[1]) ὅσα δὲ μετὰ πολέμων λέγω καὶ τῶν τοιούτων makes no sense. The previous division into ὁμολογούμενα ἀγαθά and μέσα (123, 2 f.) proves to be helpful for the emendation. I suggest, therefore, that we write ὅσα δὲ μέσα, οἷα τὰ πολέμων λέγω καὶ τῶν τοιούτων (or τὰ τοιαῦτα).

[2]) **M A** are perhaps right in omitting the article; cf. the scholion quoted on p. 76.

nique from Isocrates is well known to everyone who "has read the encomium of Busiris σὺν τέχνῃ.[1]) As a matter of fact serious objections can and must be made to the personality of Busiris. Isocrates, however, who wishes to characterize him as πανταχόθεν ἔνδοξον overcomes the difficulty with the help of the ἀντίθεσις saying that it is quite improbable that such wholesome rules could be made by anyone else but Poseidon's son (124, 4-9). The same argument with strikingly similar terminology is used at the end of the scholion III 286, 9 ff.: εἰ δέ τις εἴποι· πῶς οὖν ἐν τῷ Βουσίριδι εὕρομεν ἀντίθεσιν, καὶ ταῦτα ἑνὸς ὄντος, καὶ οὐ πόλεως, τοῦ ἐγκωμιαζομένου; λέγομεν ὅτι βασιλικὸν ἦν τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ μέγα· διὸ ἠναγκάσθη κἀκεῖ ὁ Ἰσοκράτης θεῖναι ἀντίθεσιν, ἵνα τὸ ἄδηλον ποιήσῃ ὁμολογούμενον. ἄδηλον γὰρ ἦν, εἰ ὁ Βούσιρις αἴτιος ἐγένετο τῶν τοσούτων ἀγαθῶν τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις. καὶ διὰ τῆς λύσεως ἀποδείκνυσιν ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἄλλος τούτων αἴτιός ἐστιν εἰ μὴ ὁ θεῶν παῖς ὢν ὁ Βούσιρις. We can scarcely escape the impression that upon both passages the same author has stamped his mark whether he speaks directly or through some medium. Sopater deemed it extremely important to defend Aristeides against some critics who were displeased with him because he had not refrained from discussing in his encomium inappropriate topics. For the sake of greater impressiveness Sopater did not limit himself to placing his apology in the scholia in which it was in danger of being overlooked or at least of not being duly appreciated among so many other discussions of different subjects. He placed, therefore, the same apology in the center of a treatise which was not to serve as ὑπόθεσις of the Panathenaicus but was to become a part of P. Why did he, however, give up the idea of writing a special ὑπόθεσις in addition to the treatise? He had done the same in the case of the discourse Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων. The answer is that, after the fairly long section of B in which he had discussed the main problems of the Panathenaicus quite in the manner of a ὑπόθεσις (see p. 60), a renewed discussion was unnecessary. The reference to the ὑπόθεσις of Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων is not conclusive because the analysis of H_1 has shown that Sopater's points of view in Te., the special treatise on the oration, are considerably different

[1]) The same term recurs in T 139, 6: Ἀριστείδης σὺν τέχνῃ τὴν ὕλην οἰκονομούμενος; cf. p. 74, n. 1.

from the earlier discussion in H_1 and that he had decidedly modified the view he had previously held. [1])

In contrast with all the foregoing the last sentence [2]) of Pan. is remarkably concise. Details are reserved for a later opportunity. κατὰ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, that is to say in accordance with the first announcement made by the orator, the whole discourse is called φιλότιμος. This statement refers to the prooemium in which Aristeides declares that he is not going to follow the paths trod by his predecessors whose achievements he considers inadequate to the subject, expressing the ambitious hope that he will be able to surpass them, and it is a keystone of the analysis of P because it deliberately recalls C 118, 6 φιλότιμός ἐστιν ὁ ἀνὴρ πανταχοῦ. The second statement is made about Aristeides' σεμνοτάτη φύσις, the third calls him αὐξητικός because he imitated the temper and diction of Demosthenes, and the following parenthesis explains why an encomiast cannot abstain from αὔξησις. The unexpressed idea is that the author of an encomium of Athens and the Athenians cannot proceed in the same way as a historian who writes on the same subject. The manner in which the author makes all these statements is strange, for he says: I shall have to face the necessity of proving that all I say is correct, when I shall discuss the lucidity of his diction. We have seen that the author limits himself in Pan. to discussing in detail but two subjects, the discourse as typical example for the εἶδος ἐγκωμιαστικόν and the problem of the ἀμφίδοξα, which he justified with the help of the comparison of Aristeides with Isocrates. Now the last words which I have just quoted contain the unmistakable announcement by the author and the promise that he is going to enter upon a different inquiry περὶ τοῦ σαφοῦς τῆς 'Αριστείδου λέξεως some time later. He says

[1]) The last brief sentence of this section καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον recurs in a corresponding passage of Te. 149, 12 f.; cf. p. 74, n. 1 and p. 76, n. 1.

[2]) Because of erroneous punctuation, it has become unintelligible in Dindorf's edition. Dindorf was wrong in dissecting it into three. The construction is rather the following: ὅτι . . . . ὁ λόγος φιλότιμος (sc. ἐστι) καὶ . . . . . καὶ τετήρηκε σεμνοτάτην φύσιν διδούς, καὶ ὡς αὐξητικὸς τυγχάνει . . τὴν Δημοσθένους βίαν μιμούμενος, μετὰ τοῦτο (not μετὰ τούτων) δεικνύναι τὸ σαφὲς τῆς λέξεως ἐπεξιόντες παρατηρήσομεν. After μιμούμενος there follows a parenthesis: — οὐ γὰρ ἀρκεῖ τὰ τῶν ἐγκωμίων τῇ φύσει, ἀλλὰ . . . . προστίθησιν (sc. 'Αριστείδης) . . . . ἐπαύξων τὰ κατορθούμενα —.

ἐπεξιόντες παρατηρήσομεν but does not say νῦν as he does in turning from T to E 141, 3. In this new or additional inquiry he plans to discuss some questions which center on the lucid diction of Aristeides and are, at the same time, essential to a better understanding of the Panathenaicus from more general points of view. Now we find in two passages of C the term λέξις. 119, 3 the author examines the relationship between λέξις and νοεῖν and comes to the result that Aristeides lays greater stress on the νοεῖν. Shortly before he says that Aristeides did not indulge in the τροπικαῖς τῶν λέξεων wherever occasion offered. Under these circumstances are we right in assuming that Pan. refers to C? We certainly are not, unless we also assume first that C is the treatise announced by the author as being planned but not as yet written, secondly that C was added to B after it was completed as an independent brief treatise, and thirdly that the promise that the author is going to discuss the problem later on was not cancelled in Pan. No one will consider such a hypothesis probable if we must take so many presuppositions simultaneously, not to speak of the reference in Pan. to C 118, 5 f. (see p. 77) which makes it clear that C had been composed earlier. In addition the analysis of B and C has shown that both are indissolubly connected and that the type of biography of which B is a representative demands from its beginning for the discussion of the character of style in order to be complete. The last and perhaps the most decisive objection is that at the beginning of C the discussion of τοῦ χαρακτῆρος καὶ τῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις 'Αριστείδου φύσεως is announced but not of τῆς 'Αριστείδου λέξεως. The result is clear enough: C cannot be announced in Pan. as being planned.

C not announced in Pan.

Now we must compare again the difficult passage C 118, 12 f. for which the redactors of the two manuscripts **K a** or the redactor of their common source found no other remedy than to interpolate C out of C•. the decisive words are: τὴν δὲ λέξιν κύριος ἀσφαλὴς ἀρχαῖος σαφής. They introduce into C just the two terms λέξις and σαφής on which the author puts strong emphasis at the end of Pan. The following two questions can, therefore, no longer be avoided: first how about the relationship between C and C•, and secondly is C• the treatise περὶ τοῦ σαφοῦς τῆς 'Αριστείδου λέξεως which is promised by the author at the end of Pan.? The answer

C•

to these questions is of the greatest importance for the ultimate understanding of the concluding sentence of Pan. It can, however, not be given immediately but only through an interpretation of Te.

IV.

Te

The great majority of the manuscripts presents after Pan. a long treatise (127-151) which, speaking as vaguely as possible, deals with the relations between Aristeides and Plato. The most striking external difference between this treatise on the one hand and B + C and Pan. on the other hand is its beginning and its end. The opening words contain a dedication and at the end Sopater introduces himself as the author of the treatise speaking of himself in the first person as a kind of σφραγίς. The addressee is a certain Alexander who is called τιμιώτατος and cannot be defined precisely. Sopater informs him and by inference the reader of the specific purpose of writing this pamphlet. It is his design to describe Plato's and Aristeides' μεταχείρισις in general, that is, the treatise is going to focus upon the Platonic discourses or one of them. As the whole collection P stands now it seems strange that the dedication appears in a treatise placed in the body of it instead of at its beginning. This becomes less strange if we presuppose that Te. was not published together with B + C and Pan. but presents the views held by Sopater on another, or rather, if we remember the results of the comparison between H_1 and Te. (see p. 15 ff.), on a more recent stage of his study of Aristeides. If it proves true that B + C and Pan. must be attributed to an earlier stage than Te. and that Te. was composed because Sopater felt that he now was able to revise and supplement his previous points of view as expressed in H_1 and wished to publish the results of his renewed and more penetrating research, another circumstance gains force and can be easily explained. The manuscript **M** does not offer the whole collection P but only a selection from it, namely B C and Pan., that is to say it offers those three or, if we take B and C as a unity as we should, two treatises which, because of our analysis, we claim for the earlier stage of Sopater's research on Aristeides—I call it from now on P_1—whereas the other manuscripts

Dedication

Purpose

Consequences for P

present the enlarged collection P which consists of P_1 and Te. (= P_2). Whether Sopater published both editions himself or P_2 is due to the activity of a more recent redactor remains to be seen. I hope that the interpretation of C^a will also help in answering this question.

Beginning of Te.

However this may be, the recognition that Te. represents a new stage of Sopater's research is in any case important for a better understanding of the very first words of the treatise Te. It is significant that Sopater places the name of Aristeides at the beginning. The reader learns at first glance of whom the author is going to speak. But why does he make the addition ὁ σοφιστής? Such an emphasis would be hard to explain if the arrangement P_1 (= B + C and Pan.) + Te. should reproduce the original plan of the author. After studying two treatises, one of which is of considerable length, the reader knows sufficiently that P deals with the "sophist" Aristeides. The addition becomes, however, intelligible and receives its specific meaning if we bear in mind that Sopater in writing and publishing Te. does not expect the reader to have P_1 at hand. The interpretation of the addition ὁ σοφιστής leads, therefore, to the same result as the appearance of the dedication, that originally Te. stood apart and was not published in connection with P_1. The meaning of the first sentence is that Aristeides wished to change Plato's critique or rather calumnies of the Athenian rhetoricians in the Gorgias into their opposite, that is praise. For this reason he wrote the λόγος, and in so doing he used, for a more efficient refutation, τὸ πιθανόν. The singular τὸν λόγον indicates that Sopater refers not to the three or, if we divide the first into two following the manuscripts, four Platonic discourses but to one of them. The expression τὸν λόγον was much too vague for the reader, unless he had been fully informed by an adequate
Title title. The content of Te. shows that Sopater is exclusively interested in 'Υπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων. [1]) The manuscripts which in their titles

[1]) Cf. above all 138, 14 ff. πρὸς μὲν τὸν περὶ ῥητορικῆς λόγον τοὺς ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς λόγους συνέγραψε, πρὸς δὲ τὴν διαβολὴν τῶν ἀνδρῶν τὸν νῦν εἰς ἐξήγησιν ἡμῖν προκείμενον.

refer to the discourse 'Υπὲρ ῥητορικῆς are, therefore, as untrustworthy as the second group which includes both discourses in the title, and Dindorf was wrong in following them. The first group is formed by more recent manuscripts, most of which have become known to us in earlier sections of this inquiry, such as Marc. graec. 424; Vat. graec. 77. 79. 1336; Barb. graec. 237 and Paris. graec. 2952. They call Te. either Prolegomena or Hypothesis and can be eliminated without further consideration. The same is true of the second group which is represented by the older manuscript **K**. It proves to be unreliable again. The title it offers reads as follows: (Π)ρολεγόμενα τῶν ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς λόγων καὶ τῶν (not τοῦ) [1]) ὑπὲρ τῶν τεσσάρων. Also **p** (= Pal. graec. 90) is without any value since it contents itself with the marginal note εἰς τὸ αὐτό which refers to the preceding H_1. Under these circumstances but three manuscripts are left: **V** and **A v**. They agree, inasmuch as they name 'Υπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων exclusively, they differ, however, considerably, inasmuch as **V** speaks of Hypothesis, **A v**, however, of Prolegomena. The characterization as Hypothesis is wrong for two reasons: first because Sopater's Hypothesis of the oration is extant in H_1 and secondly on account of the dedication and the σφραγίς which are quite incompatible with a Hypothesis but very appropriate to an independent treatise which everyone could read and understand without looking into the text of the discourse.[2]) The necessity of eliminating, therefore, **V** also and of adopting the redaction offered by **A v** [3]) is strengthened by the corresponding

[1]) τῶν, if it is not a mere mistake occasioned by the preceding τῶν, probably with reference to the five sections Pericles, Miltiades, Cimon, Themistocles and Κοινὴ ἀπολογία which are separated in the manuscripts from each other.

[2]) Libanius who wrote 'Υποθέσεις τῶν λόγων τοῦ Δημοσθένους placed before them a biography of Demosthenes which includes a survey of his activity in the fields of the ἐπιδεικτικός, δικανικός, συμβουλευτικὸς λόγος. It begins with a dedication. Libanius calls his treatise σύνταγμα (p. 1, 10 Fuhr), i.e. an independent composition which is intelligible without the text of the works of the author in question. That is an absolutely parallel case.

[3]) So far as the text is concerned we have every reason for being sceptical against the two manuscripts which we must form into one group with **R p**. It has the distinct tendency to normalize the diction in the manner characterized above. This tendency may be illustrated by a few examples: 128, 15 ἀλλὰ πάντα καὶ τὰ παρ' ἄλλων γιγνόμενα: τὰ δὲ ἄλλα πάντα καὶ τὰ **AR p v**;

title of Pan., of which the best attested version is Προλεγόμενα τοῦ Παναθηναϊκοῦ (A B K M). Under these circumstances we must assume that **A v** are right in presenting if not the original title, at least a version which is close to and in harmony with Sopater's intentions, with one restriction, however: it is not very plausible that Sopater who refers to one λόγος (see p. 80, n. 1) wrote Προλεγόμενα τῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν τεσσάρων. I think that we must replace the plural which seems to go back to the redactor (see p. 81, n. 1) by the singular.

Analysis of Te.

After making a general statement about the purpose of his treatise (see p. 79) he specifies the topics which he is going to discuss. He introduces a bipartition: the subject of the first section which is to be less extensive is the nature of the πολιτικός, in the second he plans to discuss the ὑπόθεσις (argumentum) of the oration (127, 7 f.). The first section which pretends to be very philosophical has two subdivisions (127, 9-128, 15 and 129, 1-130, 13). The line of demarcation between them is formed by the sentence καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἀπόχρη περὶ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ. The definition of the πολιτικός which is given in the first section is applied in the second to the orators. Through a closer examination of the views of some certain philosophers he wishes to find out whether the orators may be called πολιτικοί. He does not define those philosophers but contents himself with saying that they had some objections to the discourse. This remark lifts for a short moment the veil which conceals most of the details of the contemporary struggle between rhetoricians and philosophers because almost the entire material has become lost and shows that the struggle had gained strength through

The πολιτικός

130, 13 μέν φασι γεγενῆσθαι: μὲν γεγενῆσθαί φασιν **A R p v**; 131, 2 ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος γένηται: ὁ λόγος ἡμῖν γένηται **A p v**; 136, 5 f. φησιν ἐφυγάδευσαν αὐτὸν: ὡς is added before ἐφυγάδευσαν in **p r v** (**r** does not handle the text in a manner different from **R**; 138, 4 f. εἰ δὲ δεῖ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἀναλαβόντα συντόμως εἰπεῖν, Σωκράτης τὴν νῦν ῥητορικὴν διέβαλεν οὐκ οὖσαν πολιτικήν: συντόμως ἀναλαβόντα εἰπεῖν and διέβαλεν ὡς οὐκ οὖσαν **A p r v**; 138, 6 f. προσαγαγόντος: προσαγορεύοντος **p r**; 139, 3 ἐν μεθόδῳ τὰς λύσεις . . . ἀπεργασάμενος: ἐμμεθόδους **A p r v**; 142, 18 θελήσαιμεν: θελήσωμεν **A p r v**; and above all 141, 3 σκεψώμεθα **A p v**—**r** is missing—which replaces very significantly the unusual but doubtless original form ὀψώμεθα (see also p. 89, n. 1); for the opposite view see p. 83, n. 2.

Aristeides' retaliatory attacks upon Plato. Much light would be thrown on the history of Platonism and Antiplatonism in the second, third and fourth centuries A.D. if we possessed a larger amount of those philosophical and rhetorical treatises.

The first subdivision centers on the question as to the πολιτικός. Sopater describes him in general terms and characterizes his activity as universal and comprehensive. He supervises everything in the administration of the state. He is, however, not active in any restricted field or department of the government but gives, because of his pre-eminent expertness, the necessary directions and instructions to all the others who are in charge of the many various tasks of political life. He is perfect in himself and depends only on himself. All the others from the general and rhetorician down to the handicraftsman do specific works whose purposes and goals lie outside of their own person; he is the only one, however, to have his τέλος in nothing else (but himself) and comprises in himself τὸ καλόν and τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν, for which also all the others are striving (128, 15). This definition or rather description provides the basis for the central question of the second subdivision as to the relations between the rhetoricians and the πολιτικός. Sopater feels that he cannot avoid that question because the addressee of the treatise and by inference the reader must have a clear idea of it ἵνα πανταχόθεν θεωρῇς ἐν τοῖς ἐδαφίοις [1]) τὸν ῥήτορα. It is true that Aristeides had a very good knowledge of the part which the πολιτικός plays in the life of the state although his opponents among the philosophers were wrong in averring that he was not familiar enough with Plato and misunderstood the true character of the πολιτικός. Should you find this view somewhere [2]) you must know that, if anyone at all, Aristeides was very correct in using those terms (πολιτικός, ῥήτορες). The opponents admit that it is the essential function of the πολιτικός to give the necessary directions to all

[1]) That means in the text of the discourse; the same term occurs at the end of C*.

[2]) ἀλλ' εἰ ἐντυγχάνοις τῷ λόγῳ, τὰς (**A R p v**: τῆς **B K P V b m**) προσηγορίας, εἴπερ τις ἄλλος ἀκριβῶς εὑρίσκεται, ταύτας καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπιστάμενος ὁ σοφιστής (sc. ἐστι or better εὑρίσκεται). This passage gives a good proof that we must not reject on principle the text of the group **A R p v** in spite of all its arbitrariness discussed on p. 81 f., n. 3.

the others who serve the state. So far as the rhetoricians are concerned, they change, however, the view to its opposite criticizing the rhetoricians for receiving their own directions from the people and the laws and calling them, therefore, servants. The πολιτικός has all human virtues in himself and bestows benefits upon his fellow countrymen, the rhetoricians, however, being unable to make the Athenians καλοὺς κἀγαθούς were no πολιτικοί. In addition the people put them on trial and condemned them. If these trials were acts of justice and the men deserved the verdict they could not be true πολιτικοί because they did not possess all those virtues which the πολιτικός is supposed to comprise in himself; if they did not deserve to be persecuted they were no πολιτικοί either, since they were unable to influence the people and to change its character. If they were devoted to democracy they were no true πολιτικοί, since the πολιτικός is an image of the best constitution and resembles the king. They were no πολιτικοί either if they were loyal to the laws instead of being advisers and representing the law by themselves. For all these reasons Aristeides the Just who is generally called πολιτικός was not fond of being active in the political field. From this you must learn—Sopater sums up—that Aristeides had to make an utmost effort to point out by his encomia—let us bear in mind from now on that it is Sopater who uses this term—that the men concerned were πολιτικοί nevertheless, and had to subordinate the encomia to that higher purpose.

It is worthwhile, before we go on analyzing Te., to cast a glance at the philosophical terminology used by Sopater in his circumstantial polemic against Aristeides' opponents, and to include in this examination also the second subdivision although we do not know to which philosophers he refers. Passages like 128, 5 f. ἡ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ ἐπιστήμη βασιλική and 129, 10 ὁ πολιτικὸς πάντων ἐπιστημων ἐστὶ καὶ ἐπιτακτικός suggest that Plato's Politicus (and Gorgias as well) was Sopater's basis. Nevertheless he did not restrict himself to exploiting Plato. He uses expressions which develop into current terms at various periods of philosophical writing, for instance: 127, 10 θεωρητικός τινος: pseudo-Plato Ὅροι and, with the preposition περί,: Aristotle; 127, 10 ἐνεργῶν: Aristotle; 128, 2 ῥητορεύειν: Plato Gorg. 512 d; 128, 3 τέλειον: Plato; 128, 3

ἀπροσδεής: Clem. I Cor. 52, 1 and Plutarch; 128, 5 f. βασιλικὴ ἐπιστήμη: Plato Polit. 292 e; 128, 11 χαλινοποιός: late, but χαλινοποι(ητ-)ική Aristotle; 128, 15 ἔφεσις = strife: pseudo-Plato Ὅροι, and Aristotle; 129, 10 ἐπιτακτικός: Plato Polit.; 129, 13 εὐεργετικός: pseudo-Plato Ὅροι, and Aristotle; 129, 14 κατασκευαστικός with gen.: late, without gen.: Aristotle; 130, 11 περιεκτικός: Plutarch; 130, 11 f. ἀστασίαστος καὶ ἀτάραχος: the first adjective as early as 5th century, the second as late as Aristotle. One has not the impression that Sopater borrowed the arguments from one certain author, he rather composed the section independently interweaving, however, reminiscences from Plato and Aristotle and using the nameless philosophical pamphlet which was directed against Aristeides.

Purpose of Te.

131, 2 f. Sopater makes a clear statement about the purpose of the treatise. It is to serve as foundation for a detailed interpretation (ἐξήγησις), that is he plans to go far beyond the horizon of a mere ὑπόθεσις which usually restricts itself to informing the reader of the background and some indispensable circumstances, without whose knowledge he cannot understand the work in question, and to summing up the content. It would be, therefore, just as inappropriate to place Te. immediately before the text of the discourse as it is appropriate in the case of H_1. We infer from Sopater's words that he intends to interpret the whole oration to his students, in other words to provide the material for composing scholia. In this case it is an absolutely secondary question whether he wrote them down personally or had them written by a pupil who was equipped with his master's material. This explanatory work is still extant in our older scholia notwithstanding all the transformations and changes which they were to undergo. As preliminary step to that detailed interpretation he must clear up the fundamental questions systematically and successively. This attempt is made in the first section of Te. in which he defines the πολιτικός and examines the distinction between the rhetorician and the πολιτικός. The chief subject of the second section which starts 131, 3 is the ὑπόθεσις (argumentum) of the oration (127, 8). This

Survey of Plato's Gorgias

can be adequately defined only through a survey [1]) of Plato's Gorgias (131, 3-138, 13), in which he does not follow scrupulously the original order of the various arguments in Plato. In many sentences of the summary he inserts either φησί (sc. Plato) or φησὶν ὁ Καλλικλῆς or Σωκράτης or the like. That does not mean that all these passages are real quotations from the Gorgias, most of them are more or less vague paraphrases. Occasionally he even goes so far as to place in juxtaposition questions and answers which are not consecutive in Plato. The manner in which Sopater handles the original is hopelessly confused in Dindorf's text. Once he even has introduced a wrong punctuation which makes the whole passage unintelligible. 517 a Plato says: οὗτοι δὲ ἀνεφάνησαν ἐξ ἴσου τοῖς νῦν ὄντες, ὥστε, εἰ οὗτοι ῥήτορες ἦσαν, οὔτε τῇ ἀληθινῇ ῥητορικῇ ἐχρῶντο—οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐξέπεσον—οὔτε τῇ κολακικῇ.—ΚΑΛ. ἀλλὰ μέντοι πολλοῦ γε δεῖ, ὦ Σώκρατες, μή ποτέ τις τῶν νῦν ἔργα τοιαῦτα ἐργάσηται οἷα τούτων ὅστις βούλει εἴργασται. To this objection Socrates replies in a long discourse of which the first words are: ὦ δαιμόνιε, οὐδ'ἐγὼ ψέγω τούτους ὥς γε διακόνους εἶναι πόλεως, ἀλλά μοι δοκοῦσι τῶν γε νῦν διακονικώτεροι γεγονέναι. This argument has received an entirely new shape in Sopater's transformation and reads now as follows: ὥστε, εἰ οὗτοι ῥήτορες ἦσαν, οὐ [2]) τῇ ἀληθινῇ ῥητορικῇ ἐχρῶντο —ἀληθινὴν δὲ λέγει τὴν πολιτικήν—οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐξέπεσον. After ἐξέπεσον there is a period. Callicles' answer which follows in Plato is condensed to the four words ἀλλὰ μεγάλα ἔργα εἰργάσαντο with the additional remark φησὶν ὁ Καλλικλῆς. The period after εἰργάσαντο in Dindorf's text must be replaced by a comma which indicates that φησὶν ὁ Καλλικλῆς belongs to the foregoing instead of to the following.

[1]) ἐφοδεύσω τὸν διάλογον; the verb ἐφοδεύειν takes on this meaning not until Plutarch.

[2]) Almost all the manuscripts have οὔτε instead of οὐ under the influence of the Platonic original; οὐ is offered only by three more recent manuscripts, the Pal. graec. 29, Vat. graec. 77 and Marc. graec. 424—in this manuscript the words οὐ τῇ fill a lacuna left by the copyist; I was unable to notice any traces of rasure on the photostat. οὔτε makes no sense, unless we annul the change of construction which was made by Sopater, and consider the words οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐξέπεσον a second parenthesis consecutive to the parenthesis ἀληθινὴν δὲ λέγει τὴν πολιτικήν, and unless we assume that after ἐξέπεσον the words οὔτε τῇ κολακικῇ were omitted by some mistake. That is, however, quite unconvincing.

The direct address ὦ δαιμόνιε which indicates that Socrates begins to speak is omitted. As equivalent Sopater inserts φησὶ (sc. ὁ Σωκράτης) at the earliest possible place, namely after οὐδὲ ἐγώ, and goes on in accordance with Plato: τούτους ὡς διακόνους.

Text of Plato's works

The copy of Plato's dialogues which was used by Sopater was not very closely related to any of the four "leading" manuscripts **B T P F**, it rather offered a contaminated text of that type, the remains of which did not escape Burnet's attention [1]). For details I refer to my notes in the apparatus criticus. That does not exclude the possibility that in some manuscripts the text of the quotations from and references to Plato was influenced [2]) by that form of the text of Plato which has come down to us in our complete manuscripts. Finally, the editor must consider the further alternative that occasionally Sopater, for making himself more easily understood by the readers, changed the original deliberately, in other words that he interpolated. This seems to be true of 136, 5 f. ἐφυγάδευσαν instead of the original ἐξωστράκισαν.

Transition to ὑπόθεσις

The last sentence of this section (138, 10-13) gives the reason why it is just in the conversation between Socrates and Gorgias that the inquiry into the character of rhetoric is made and why the political questions are discussed between Socrates and Callicles. The explanation is that Gorgias being a sophist is much more interested in problems of rhetoric than of politics, whereas the politician Callicles does not care very much for any theoretical definitions but is an appropriate participant for testing the Athenian statesmen. The preliminary skirmish between Socrates and Polos is completely disregarded although in the previous survey of the dialogue Polos is referred to twice. The reason for this difference is very clear. It is true that the survey which lays the foundations for the discussion of the ὑπόθεσις offers the opportunity to refer to

[1]) Platonis Opera ed. J. Burnet, vol. I, p. IV f.
[2]) Cf. p. 86, n. 1.—It is not surprising that the same is true of the quotations from Plato in Aristeides' discourses.

Polos summarily; it is, however, no less true that the discussion of the ὑπόθεσις is functionally different, and leaves no room for the section of the Gorgias in which Polos is Socrates' opponent. The decisive reason for the coexistence of the two [1]) orations 'Ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς and 'Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων (138, 14-139, 4) is that the Gorgias also is bipartite and must be divided into a λόγος περὶ ῥητορικῆς and a λόγος κατὰ τῶν τεττάρων. He had, therefore, to ignore the first section of the Gorgias. Aristeides borrowed from Plato—he now goes on—the principle of bipartition and wrote against Plato's λόγος περὶ ῥητορικῆς his λόγος ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς and against the attacks upon the four politicians the λόγος which he is going to interpret. These last words τὸν νῦν εἰς ἐξήγησιν ἡμῖν προκείμενον look back to 131, 2 f. (see p. 85) and indicate again that the whole treatise is preliminary to the detailed commentary which is going to follow, and represents almost a general commentary in a nutshell.

The ὑπόθεσις.

The general comparison between the Gorgias and the oration has enabled Sopater to attempt the close examination of the ὑπόθεσις (argumentum) of the oration. Aristeides—he declares—is strictly opposite to Plato in his procedure. Plato begins with definitions (ὅροι) and turns from them to testing individuals and discussing their deeds. Aristeides, however, starts from the deeds and turns back or ascends to the conception of πολιτικός pondering whether or not the various deeds of the men are in harmony with the cardinal virtues of δικαιοσύνη, σωφροσύνη, ἀνδρεία and φρόνησις which the true πολιτικός combines in himself. He omits, however, to attempt a new definition of the πολιτικός in competition with Plato. What the four men did in particular confirms the view that they must be considered πολιτικοί (139, 4-140, 7).

One might wonder why Sopater is so brief in these arguments on which the treatise centers according to Sopater's own statement.

[1]) Although he divides the discourse 'Ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς into two separate sections in accordance with the manuscripts which have come down to us, he considers it a unity.

The explanation is that on the one hand it was his design to narrate the ὑπόθεσις (argumentum) of the oration, on the other hand he did not announce at all that he would sum up the content of the whole discourse. First he did not need to repeat himself because H_1 had been written previously as has appeared above. Secondly it cannot be denied that he succeeded in informing the reader quite well in a few words of his own point of view and of Aristeides' reasons for and purposes of composing the discourse and his method as well. Thirdly it will appear from the analysis of the long section which is devoted to defining the εἶδος of the oration that Sopater strives to put εἶδος and ὑπόθεσις into mutual relations. The consequence of this tendency is that the line of demarcation between the two sections is obliterated and thereby the relatively brief section in which the ὑπόθεσις is discussed is considerably extended.

The analysis of Pan. has made it clear that Sopater lays emphasis on establishing relations between Aristeides and Isocrates, inasmuch as, with reference to Isocrates' Busiris, he raises the question how it can be justified that the author of an encomium reports deeds which seem to throw unfavorable light on the hero and deserve to be criticized. The same tendency to connect Aristeides with Isocrates recurs in Te. Sopater speaks, however, cautiously (140, 7 f.): καὶ δοκεῖ ἐκ τῶν Ἰσοκράτους παραινέσεων εἰληφέναι τὴν μεταχείρισιν. Both of them avoid general and theoretical discussions of the four cardinal virtues. They start rather from special deeds (πράξεις) of the men who are shown as models in the παραινέσεις—this refers to Isocrates—or praised in the encomia (Aristeides). In so doing they wish to inspire ἀρετή (Isocrates) or to demonstrate the disputed ἀρετή of the rhetoricians (Aristeides). The proof of their having ἀρετή implies their being πολιτικοί and changes the attacks upon them to an encomium. The characteristic way in which Aristeides dealt with the πράγματα becomes still more evident if the εἶδος of the oration is considered. It must be examined more closely (140, 8-141, 3).[1])

[1]) The unusual form ὀψώμεθα which has been preserved in **P V** only is sufficiently confirmed by Plat. Leg. XII 947 c ἐπ‹ι›όψωνται (cf. Lobeck, Phrynichos p. 734). It is not surprising that it was replaced by ὀψόμεθα (**B K b m**); σκεψώμεθα (**A p v**), however, is an impudent interpolation

Transition from T to E

These last words of the section form the transition from the first part (T) of the treatise (Te.) to the second (E) and indicate that Sopater carefully tried to connect them, however divergent they be, with the smallest possible friction. We shall have to pay attention to the important question as to further links between T and E. The fact that the dedication to Alexander at the beginning of T is counterbalanced by the σφραγίς at the end of E seems to suggest that to Sopater's mind E was to serve as second part of Te. from the beginning and that he did not attach it to T by way of addition. We cannot content ourselves, however, with this simple statement; on the contrary the matter becomes more complicated because the manuscripts differ from each other. The final decision must, therefore, be based again on the result of the analysis. The manuscript **R** or **r** respectively must be eliminated at once. In it E is separated from T (see p. 47) and presented after C. T, however, for which the original **R** is partly available—the missing part was supplied by **r**—is placed after B and both cover, as I have said above, the first leaves of the manuscript. This arrangement conflicts with one of the main results of the previous analysis from which it has appeared that B + C were to take the first place in the collection P_1. The change of order had some significant consequences for the text in **r**. The sentence 141, 3 καὶ νῦν εἰ δοκεῖ σαφέστερον τοῦτο ὀψώμεθα which forms the bridge from T to E lost its function and had to be omitted. The preceding sentence, however, which also prepares for the imminent discussion in E δείκνυσι γὰρ καὶ τὸ εἶδος τοῦ λόγου σαφῶς τὰ πράγματα κείμενα remained untouched and became the concluding sentence of T. That is an absurdity which shows more than anything else the arbitrariness with which P was handled in **R** (**r**). A further consequence of separating E from T in this way is the senselessness of the direct address εὑρήσεις (142, 6) which, however, makes very good sense, if the dedication to Alexander at the beginning of T is supposed to precede.

although it is significant, inasmuch as it shows that the form which it replaced was in all probability the subjunctive ὀψώμεθα; cf. also p. 81 f., n. 3 at the end.

It is of small importance that in the 15th century manuscript **m** E is missing completely and that in the Pal. graec. 29 (**b**) H_2 instead of E is presented after T. The rest of the manuscripts requires, however, our full attention. **K P V** insert between T and E a new heading which appears also in **R** between C and E. It reads as follows: Περὶ τοῦ εἴδους τοῦ λόγου. **A v** which have also preserved the best version of the title of T (or Te.), as we have seen above (see p. 81 f.) go on after σκεψώμεθα (instead of ὀψώμεθα, see p. 89, n. 1) without any title or sign or paragraph. The same is true of the text in **p** which, however, places the title in the margin. That is a striking difference from the usage in B and Pan. in which the two titles are given before the respective texts. Thereby the scribe wishes to indicate that no new treatise of P is supposed to begin but only a new section with a content somewhat different from the content of the previous sections of the same treatise. The various procedures followed by these manuscripts may—but need not since other explanations are at hand—explain a variant reading at the beginning of E. Its first words are in **B K P V** φασί τινες: φασὶ γάρ τινες in **A p v**. [1]) I do not see any possibility of deciding which group followed the intentions of the author more faithfully. It may well be that Sopater himself used γάρ in order to emphasize the close connection between E and T. It is, however, no less plausible that γάρ was added in the manuscript to which **A p v** ultimately go back. Also in the case of asyndeton the previous sentence 141, 3 f. καὶ νῦν εἰ δοκεῖ σαφέστερον τοῦτο ὀψώμεθα provides a sufficiently strong link between T and E. We must never forget that so far as details of the text are concerned the manuscripts **A p v** have appeared again and again not very trustworthy (see p. 81 f., n. 3 and p. 89, n. 1). In addition to this general consideration another similar case warns us against over-confidence in the case of the conjunction γάρ, I mean the transition from 144, 7 f. to 144, 9 ff. 144, 7-8 the discussion of a new subject is announced, and 9 the discussion starts asyndetically: οὐ μὴν καὶ περὶ τούτου ποιησόμεθα τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν, ἵνα μηδὲν ἀνεξέταστον ᾖ. τινὲς τῶν ἐμπρεψάντων ἐνδόξως ἐφ'ἡμῶν etc. Under these circumstances it

[1]) It goes without saying that **R** in which E is separated from T (see p. 90) stands apart from this group to which its text belongs.

seems more advisable to decide against **A p v** and omit γάρ in the text of E.

The discussion of the εἶδος of the discourse begins with a negative argument. The interpretation of the oration as δικανικὸς λόγος (141, 5 f.) is characterized as absurd, and the representatives of this view are called οἱ τὰς βαθείας ὑπήνας ἕλκοντες. That is a quotation from Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων II 280, 12 D. To the same passage of Aristeides Sopater referred in his Προγυμνάσματα. [1]) We are told by the scholiast that these words were coined by Aristophanes who bantered some contemporary philosophers. The advocates of that theory give four reasons:

(1) The preposition ὑπὲρ in the title of the oration is characteristic of a δικανικὸς λόγος.

(2) The oration has ἀντιθέσεις.

(3) The second part of the oration is "agonistic".

(4) Aristeides refers to Plato's attacks upon the men as a κατηγορία.

(1) The first argument is dealt with in a strange manner. Sopater bases his argumentation on the indiscriminate use of prepositions in the works of the παλαιοί, of whom Demosthenes is said to have used κατά—we should be less surprised if Sopater had said περί—in the sense of ὑπέρ, and Thucydides to have mixed up all the prepositions. Aristeides was, therefore free to use the preposition ὑπέρ in the title of a discourse even if that discourse was not meant by him to be a δικανικὸς λόγος.

(2) Antitheses are not unusual in encomia either—Sopater replies to the argument of his opponents referring to Isocrates' Busiris and Aristeides' Panathenaicus. He does not go into details but contents himself with stating that he discussed this subject previously, and with summing up in a few words the results attained. The words 142, 11 ff. ἔφαμεν γὰρ ὅτι τὰ ἀμφίδοξα τῶν ἐγκωμίων, ἐὰν ἀκριβῶς ἔνδοξα κατασκευάσαι θελήσωμεν, ἐξ ἀντιθέσεως λαβόντες τὰ δοκοῦντα διαβολῆς ἄξια εἰς ἐγκώμια μετατίθεμεν are a clear reference to Pan. 123, 1 ff. In view of this self-quotation or self-paraphrasis, not to speak again of the many details referred to

[1]) Fr. 8 in H. Rabe's Teubner edition of Aphthonius 69, 133.

above which are characteristic of Sopater's ways of thinking and writing [1]) I must disagree with A. Boulanger (see p. 72) who denies that there are any sufficient reasons for attributing Pan. to Sopater.

(3) It would have been easy for Sopater to pass over this argument in very few words and to say merely that "agonistic" elements are admissable in any type of written treatise or spoken discourse and have always been used. It is true that the δικανικὴ ὑπόθεσις —he does not say δικανικὸς λόγος and thereby changes the view slightly but perhaps deliberately—is the presupposition of the term ἀγωνιστικός; it is, however, no less true [2]) that we may speak of ἀγωνιστικὸς λόγος also in the case of different argumenta, such as literary polemic (μαχίμως) against any passage of Homer with which we are displeased for any reason, for it is necessary to consider everywhere τῶν πραγμάτων τὴν φύσιν καὶ τῆς ὕλης τὸ εἶδος. Instead of restricting himself to these few arguments, however, he raises for the second time the question as to the bearing of Plato's criticizing the four men for not being πολιτικοί (143, 6-144, 5). Thus it appears that E has a twofold purpose, inasmuch as it centers not only on the εἶδος of the oration but carries on the discussion of the chief problem of T. Now it becomes clear why Sopater has substituted in the passage referred to shortly before the term δικανικὴ ὑπόθεσις for δικανικὸς λόγος and why he speaks of τῆς ὕλης τὸ εἶδος. This insight into the structure of Te. confirms the result attained previously that the treatise consists of two carefully balanced subdivisions (T and E) and that E is not an additional section but forms an *integral* element of the original plan. In particular Sopater's most important arguments are the following ones: Plato's denial that the four men were πολιτικοί implies the main charge that they did not possess the cardinal virtues. With discussions like these which ultimately mean an imputation of wrongdoing in a field other than legal and a defamation of their characters as well no δικανικὸς λόγος is concerned. It is, therefore, not the polemical character of a treatise or discourse which is the mark of a genuine δικανικὸς λόγος, but the φύσις τῶν

[1]) For the details I refer to the analysis of Pan.
[2]) See p. 107.

πραγμάτων sufficiently proves that the ὑπόθεσις of the oration is encomiastic.

(4) No importance should be attached to the characterization of Plato's attacks as κατηγορία since the noun κατηγορία has the two different meanings of accusation or charge against someone and of predication of a subject as well. The only concession which can be made is, therefore, that Aristeides using the term κατηγορία augmented the matter in order to persuade the audience that Plato had accused the men instead of testing them. [1])

Sopater does not acquiesce in this negative and merely destructive critique. [2]) We have learned from the analysis of H_1 that already in a previous stage of his research on Aristeides he was able to make some positive statements about the εἶδος. Now he has to set forth something different again. In order to pave the way for his new insight he first eliminates many erroneous interpretations. This survey which begins 144, 9 f. is carefully linked with the preceding polemic against the view of δικανικὸς λόγος. Although the proof that the oration is no δικανικὸς λόγος implies the idea that it excludes any στάσις and a definite proof of it is unnecessary—he declares—"yet I will survey that question lest anything be left unexamined" (144, 5-8). [3])

The στάσις problem on which Sopater touches in the preliminary statement that the discourse does not admit στάσεις of any kind

[1]) There are in Dindorf's edition below the text some sentences which he took from the Junta edition. They present an epitome from 143, 10-144, 10 which was to replace that longer passage and limit themselves to expressing the content as concisely as possible, omitting all details as unnecessary. This epitome is without any value. Dindorf did not know that the reference to the Junta edition must be replaced by a reference to its original, the Laur. Conv. soppr. 9; the same epitome is offered by **b**.

[2]) The conception of the oration being a δικανικὸς λόγος is expressly disputed also in one of the older Sopater scholia on Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων III 465, 17 ff. D.

[3]) οὐ μὴν καὶ περὶ τούτου ποιησόμεθα τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν, ἵνα μηδὲν ἀνεξέταστον ᾖ: οὐ μὴν is used in the positive meaning of "yet" or "however". The common expression is οὐ μὴν ἀλλά. Although it would be easy to add ἀλλά here too, Luc. Catapl. 26 warns us against this attempt. Here it reads as follows: οὐ μὴν καὶ τῶν κολάσεων τὸ πρὸς ὠμότητα καινουργὸν αὐτοῦ τίς ἂν διηγήσασθαι δύναιτο, ὅς γε μηδὲ τῶν οἰκειοτάτων ἀπέσχετο; It is surprising that ἀλλά after οὐ μὴν has not as yet been found in any manuscript of Lucian; it is less surprising, however, that it was inserted by I. Bekker.

requires a closer examination. Sopater enters, therefore, upon an inquiry into many details of rhetoric. Sometimes he is very brief, probably because he expects the reader to be familiar with his rhetorical terminology and thereupon to understand the purpose of the various examples without further explanation. The modern reader, however, needs more help in this case than the ancient one. The best available commentary is not so much Hermogenes' book Περὶ στάσεων, although it helps considerably in the interpretation of some of the brief references, as Sopater's and Syrian's scholia on Hermogenes' book, which were published by Walz in the fourth volume of the Rhetores Graeci. Since it is not possible to present here a comprehensive commentary on the details discussed by Sopater, I must restrict myself to drawing the outlines of the principal features.

(1) The ὑπόθεσις is no μετάστασις. The advocates of this theory are referred to as τινὲς τῶν ἐμπρεψάντων ἐνδόξως ἐφ'ἡμῶν. The words ὥσπερ τι μέγα καὶ σεμνὸν ἐπινοήσαντες which follow immediately indicate that the praise of certain contemporaries is meant ironically. Similar cases which we have found again and again in discussing previous treatises of P suggest that here too τινὲς refers to but one certain rhetorician. This interpretation is confirmed by 145, 1 ff. ὁ δὲ . . . μὴ νοῶν . . . μετάστασιν εἶπε τὴν στάσιν. According to Sopater and Syrian IV 245, 23 W. ἡ . μετάστασις γίνεται, ὅταν εἰς καιρὸν ἢ εἰς πρόσωπον ἤ τι τοιοῦτον τῶν ἔξωθεν μεταφέρῃ τὸ ἔγκλημα ὁ φεύγων. Applying this direction for the appropriate use of μετάστασις to Aristeides' discourse those rhetoricians (or that rhetorician) adopt(s) Plato's charge that Pericles had made the Athenians inactive and covetous but exculpate(s) him and ἐπὶ τοὺς πρὸ αὐτοῦ [1]) μετάγουσι ῥήτορας, that means: and make the rhetoricians prior to Pericles responsible for the misconduct of the Athenians which

[1]) I cannot see any possibility to tolerate the plural αὐτῶν which is in most of the manuscripts and was adopted by Dindorf. The only form that is appropriate to the whole passage is αὐτοῦ offered in **p v** by first hand and in **R** as correction by a more recent hand. An attempt to explain αὐτῶν as referring to Pericles and to interpret Περικλέους as breviloquentia for Pericles including the three other men would be unconvincing in face of the fact that Pericles is the only one to be criticized by Plato in this specific manner (Gorg. 515 e).

was not improved under Pericles either. You know, however —Sopater addresses Alexander—that the theory of μετάστασις does not pay justice to the discourse. For Plato does not introduce that statement as primary charge. His first proposition (πρότασις) is rather that the four men were no πολιτικοί, all the rest (which includes that statement by inference) is only κατασκευή or βεβαίωσις (confirmation). In the ἀντιθετικαί to which the μετάστασις belongs the speaker must, however, start from admitting the charge against his hero or his protegee and then exonerate him dismissing the charge and charging someone else. Whether the charge be that the men were no πολιτικοί or that the Athenians had become inactive and covetous, in both cases Aristeides is far from admitting either one of the charges. The μετάστασις can, therefore, not be taken into any serious consideration (144, 9-145, 10) [1]. There is still another possibility to define the εἶδος which must, therefore, be examined as well. Two more ἀντιθετικαὶ στάσεις, the ἀντίστασις and the ἀντέγκλημα, are so close to the μετάστασις that the question arises whether denying any kind of relationship between the μετάστασις and the discourse we exclude by inference any possibility of putting those two στάσεις into relation with the discourse. Syrian IV 240, 22 W. commenting on Hermog. π. στάσ. p. 38, 21 ff. R. gives the following definition of the ἀντίστασις: ἀντίστασίς ἐστιν, ὅταν ὁ μὲν κατήγορος ἐπάγῃ τι ὡς ἀδίκημα, ὁ δὲ φεύγων αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἀρχὴν εὐεργεσίας λέγῃ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀδικήματος μεῖζον τὸ πραχθὲν εὐεργέτημα. With the ἀντίστασις the ἀντέγκλημα [2]) is at variance only in so far as in the ἀντίστασις the defendant takes the reasons, for his deeds for which he begs to be excused, from his own person, in the ἀντέγκλημα from the circumstances (περιστάσεις) which, in this case, include also his person. περίστασις is τὸ πᾶν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ λόγοις καὶ πράγμασι καὶ δίκαις καὶ ὑποθέσεσι καὶ βίῳ. The charges are either κατὰ φύσιν [3]) or κατὰ θέσιν. κατὰ φύσιν means that the

[1]) I do not include into this paraphrase the almost literal repetitio of some previous arguments, which serves, for the sake of greater impressiveness, as a kind of recapitulation.

[2]) Cf. *Hermog.* π. στάσ. p. 39, 3 ff. R.

[3]) In this discussion and in the consecutive ones as well Sopater enlarges his previous treatment of the subject in H_1 160, 8 ff. He felt that a discussion

charges are well-founded regardless of the specific or individual circumstances, for instance if a man is charged with beating his father. In a case like this the defendant may use the στάσις συγγνώμης [1]), that is: he admits that the charge is true but seeks an excuse for his deed as an involuntary (ἀκούσιον) one. In the charges κατὰ θέσιν the greatest importance must be attached to the circumstances. There exists no law against or penalty for inactivity (idleness) or covetousness. Both qualities are odious but not crimes. Consequently no ἔγκλημα can be launched by a prosecutor or admitted as being true and then turned aside by a defendant nor is the question of the circumstances of any importance whatsoever. From it it follows that the στάσις μεταστάσεως has nothing in common with the εἶδος of the oration (145, 11-147, 3).

(2) Another group of interpreters (ἄλλοι) [2]) have made a different attempt to define the ὑπόθεσις (argumentum) of the oration. They are, however, no less unsuccessful (147, 4-148, 5). [3]) They characterize the ὑπόθεσις as πραγματική and as centering on the question as to the four men being πολιτικοί. Sopater has shown also elsewhere some interest in this kind of ὑπόθεσις. In his treatise Εἰς τὴν Ἑρμογένους τέχνην V 91, 24 W. (cf. also V 226, 24 W.) he refers to Hermog. π. στάσ. p. 38, 3 R. κἂν μὲν περὶ μέλλοντος, ἔσται πραγματική holding the same view as in E. It is the characteristic peculiarity of the πραγματικὴ ὑπόθεσις that all present happenings and all events of the past as well are referred to not for their own sake but only in so far as they are or may become important for future events. Since no future events or problem play any part in the oration, it is just as absurd to consider it πραγματικὴ ὑπόθεσις as to regard a πανηγυρικὴ ὑπόθεσις as πραγματική for the simple reason that its subject is taken from events of the past. In the case of the πραγμα-

of these rhetorical questions on a large scale was at variance with the scope of a ὑπόθεσις but quite compatible with a σύγγραμμα.

[1]) *Hermog.* π. στάσ. p. 39, 8 ff. R.: μεθίστησι τὸ ἔγκλημα . . . καὶ ποιεῖ μετάστασιν ἢ εἰς οὐ δυνάμενον ὑπεύθυνον γενέσθαι, ἀνεύθυνον δὲ πάντῃ, καὶ πεποίηκε συγγνώμην.

[2]) I have translated ἄλλοι by the plural although, like τινές, it may refer to but one certain critic.

[3]) 148, 6 a paragraph is necessary. Dindorf's text does not indicate that Sopater is going to discuss a new argument.

τικὴ ὑπόθεσις the decisive point is that we πρὸς τὸ κατορθῶσαι τὰ μέλλοντα τὰ παρελθόντα λαμβάνομεν.

(3) A third attempt of definition is no less misleading. Again Sopater refers to ἄλλοι as supporters of this theory (148, 6-149, 5). Like the advocates of the πραγματικὴ ὑπόθεσις they base their interpretation upon the question as to the four men being πολιτικοί. Since the oration is supposed to center on that question, the whole problem focuses on the examination of the denotation of an ὄνομα (noun), i.e. πολιτικός, or speaking in terms of rhetoric, the στάσις is a ὅρος. [1]) To this point of view an important objection must be made. It makes a great difference whether we ask: were the men πολιτικοί, or were they not?, or must we call them πολιτικοί or must we not? In the first case it is not the noun πολιτικοί which is subject of the discussion but the deeds; that is to say the point is whether or not the deeds originate in one of the four cardinal virtues, the possession of which alone gives a man an entitled claim to be considered πολιτικός. Sopater, with unexpressed reference to the previous definition of the πολιτικός given in T 127, 8 ff., now takes this statement for granted. This reference is one more link between E and T and indicates again that T and E are two related organic parts of one and the same body: E never was independent, and T remains incomplete unless it is supplemented by E. In the second case, however, in which we wonder whether or not we must call the men πολιτικοί [2]) it is not the deeds which are examined but the noun, that is to say we ask whether or not the noun adequately characterizes some certain deeds which are generally known. ὅπερ ἐξ ἐναντίας ὑπάρχει τῷ λόγῳ, the opposite is true of the discourse. Sopater does not content himself with eliminating in this way the definition as ὅρος but sets forth an additional argument against that theory (148, 16-149, 5). Whereas the orator using the ὅρος wishes to prove that the charge is ἀτελές [3]) in order

[1]) Dindorf has obliterated the whole argument through erroneous punctuation. It reads as follows: ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις ἄλλοι φασίν, εἰ περὶ ὀνόματός ἐστιν ἡ ζήτησις, πότερόν εἰσι πολιτικοὶ ἢ οὔ, ὅρος ἡ στάσις. πρὸς οὓς λέγομεν· ἕτερόν ἐστι φάσκειν etc.

[2]) *Syrian* IV 218, 3 W. ἐν δὲ τῷ ὅρῳ περὶ κλήσεως (sc. ἡ ζήτησίς ἐστι).

[3]) *Hermog.* π. στάσ. p. 37, 1 ff. R.

that the ὑπόθεσις become ἀσύστατος[1]) by any addition made to it, this is not true of the oration. The noun πολιτικός needs no addition, the πράγματα are complete, and nothing additional exists to make the ὕλη—ὕλη is synonymous with ὑπόθεσις—which precedes immediately—ἀσύστατον.

After this additional remark Sopater turns back to one of the subjects which he had previously discussed in H_1. Since I have interpreted most of the details of this paragraph of E (149, 6-150, 15) on p. 18 ff. I now restrict myself to clearing up some additional points which were irrelevant to the comparison with H_1. In his various polemics against the interpreters of the εἶδος of the oration Sopater changes his tone repeatedly. He treats the advocates of μετάστασις (144, 9 ff.) with irony but shows little personal concern in the case of the two groups of ἄλλοι (147, 4 and 148, 6), with whose points of view he disagrees, and speaks unbiassedly and indifferently. This is, however, not true of a third "group" of ἄλλοι who consider the discourse to be an ἀνασκευή. He inveighs against them with extreme severity and calls them mad. We have seen that in all probability he refers to his favorite opponent Athanasius. In the frame of the whole treatise this paragraph has to fulfil a double task: one of them is negative, the other one positive. First he points out that the discourse is no ἀνασκευή (149, 6-13), secondly he finally propounds his own view that it is panegyric and gives his reason for this classification (149, 14-150, 15). He deliberately uses the term πανηγυρικός at the beginning and the end of the paragraph as well in order to emphasize its extreme importance. No less deliberately he varies in the second passage the expression slightly but significantly in order to round out the thought as completely as possible. At the beginning he says, therefore: ὡς πανηγυρικὸς ὁ λόγος ἐστίν, at the end, however, ὡς πανηγυρικῆς ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ὑποθέσεως.

The σφραγίς.

I have not as yet taken into account the σφραγίς with which Sopater concludes the treatise. It raises a difficult question.

[1]) ἀσύστατος: "argumentum de quo in iudicio disceptare non licet, quod in iudicio non consistit" (Ernesti, l.c., p. 45).

At first glance we are not surprised that the dedication at the beginning of T is counterbalanced at the end of its complementary part E by the σφραγίς which serves as self-introduction and quasi-signature and gives him the opportunity to speak once more to the addressee. He informs him and thus the reader that it was his design to sum up in the treatise first what he had previously learned in Athens, secondly what he had found out by research together with others who were interested in the matter, and thirdly what he had acquired through comprehensive reading. The sentence containing the σφραγίς: ταῦτ' ἐγώ σοι Σώπατρος ἐπιδίδωμι—συνήγαγον is here offered by the manuscripts **A B p v** but was transferred to a different place in **K P V r** which have it at the end of C^a. This seems to be very strange. In these four manuscripts **K P V r** the vacant space was filled with the sentence καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον which evidently repeats 149, 12 f. Now the same words καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον appear also in **Ap v** after the σφραγίς. That raises the question whether or not the repetition is due to Sopater himself, and if so, where is its original place? The circumstance that these words, which literally repeat a previous sentence, replace the σφραγίς in one group of the manuscripts, but appear after it in the other group, might raise the suspicion that, speaking as vaguely as possible, something must be wrong in this passage. The decisive reason for the disagreement between the manuscripts can scarcely be found in the treatise Te. but must be a consequence of the fact that we have not as yet reached the end of P; in other words the brief treatise C^a, the nature of which we have not as yet defined, seems to be responsible for the uncertainty in the manuscripts at the end of E. We must, therefore, examine C^a more closely.

V.

C^a Let us remember that C^a was placed after Te. in the manuscripts **K P R (r) V** and in **v** as well although it is usually closely related with **A** and **p**, in **A p**, however, after Pan. This disagreement seems to be due to the fact that the copyists having no clear idea of the correct place of C^a and its purpose placed it differently and at their own discretion.

It has appeared again and again that Sopater after concluding the discussion of a certain topic and before turning to a new one is fond of making a preliminary announcement of what he is going to discuss. There is no passage in T or E at all, however, which gives the slightest hint that Sopater had the intention to add anything to Te. Supposing C^a is a sequel to Te., there would be not only a gap between them with no transition from E to C^a but even an open conflict between the content of C^a, which deals with general problems of Aristeides' style, and Te. in which Sopater deliberately restricts himself to reasoning upon τήν τε τοῦ Πλάτωνος καὶ τὴν τοῦ σοφιστοῦ μεταχείρισιν (127, 6 f.) in the special case of Ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων. It is almost needless to say that the σφραγίς is just as inappropriate at the end of E if C^a follows immediately as third section of the treatise Te. as the additional concluding sentence of E καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον is awkward in comparison with 149, 12 f. where it is appropriately continued by the following words λοιπὸν δέ ἐστιν εἰπεῖν which have no parallel at the beginning of C^a. It results from all these incongruities that C^a was not meant to be an immediate sequel to Te. and that the words καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον were not placed after the σφραγίς by Sopater but by a redactor who wished to link C^a with E since he could not place it elsewhere. The first words of C^a (153, 1) contain the conjunction δὲ which as it stands now refers to μέν in the preceding sentence which now concludes E. [1]) Since this sentence was taken by the redactor out of 149, 12 f. it seems to be a probable hypothesis that δὲ at the beginning of C^a is due to the tendency of the redactor to strengthen the link between Te. and C^a and to conceal to the best of his ability the circumstance that C^a does not deal with any special discourse of Aristeides. A further consequence was that the σφραγίς had to be removed from its original place and was transferred to the end of C^a. It is not surprising that some of the manuscripts show, so to speak, the status nascendi, that is to say they have the additional sentence or rather the substitute after the σφραγίς and that other manuscripts present the more advanced stage of the process having the sentence in question instead of the σφραγίς. Nor is it surprising that, once the σφραγίς had been transferred

1) See note on p. 151, 1-3.

to the end of C^a, it appears not only in the manuscripts **K P V r** with which also **v** agrees but in **A p** which have it at its correct place at the end of E and also at the end of C^a which, nevertheless, was placed by the two copyists after Pan. This is one of the methodically interesting cases in which we are enabled by the manuscripts to follow the development of the changes step by step. The appearance of a new title before C^a in a few manuscripts warns us still more against connecting C^a with Te. On the other hand the arrangement Pan. C^a in **A p** and **a** has no better basis. Against **A p** which have the σφραγίς in its correct place at the end of E and after C^a as well it must be said that not only the repetition of the σφραγίς is absurd but the direct address σοι in the σφραγίς at the end of C^a refers to someone whose name appears neither in B + C nor in Pan. which have no dedication at all. Against **a**, however, which is right in omitting the σφραγίς at the end of C^a it must be said that the arrangement Pan. C^a is no less absurd than the arrangement Te. C^a, in both cases for the same reason that Pan. and Te. are special treatises on one discourse each, as the interpretation has shown, C^a, however, is a discussion of the general character of Aristeides' style.

That looks very much like running into a cul-de-sac. Is it, however, not thinkable that the redactor placing C^a after B + C and Pan. meant something quite different? We have seen on p. 79 f. that B + C and Pan. which I have called P_1 represent the result of the first stage of Sopater's research on Aristeides. Did the redactor place C^a at the end of P_1 because he was well aware of the striking resemblance between C and C^a[1]) and because he considered C^a to be a revised and enlarged redaction of C? Here we face the chief question: how about C^a? It seems to be not without significance that C^a has no title in the manuscripts except for the unreliable manuscript **K** whose qualities are not worth discussing again and the Paris. graec. 2953 which is still more unreliable. We have seen that in the more authoritative manuscripts of P titles or headings are not used unless there are important reasons for introducing them. The circumstance that C^a has no such title in those manuscripts indicates that it was either to be sequel to another extant

[1]) For the details I refer to p. 77 f.

treatise or is an unfinished fragment or the remains of a longer treatise which has become lost.

There is another circumstance which is still more remarkable than the lack of any title. C[a] begins in the manuscripts not uniformly. In the great majority of the manuscripts the first words of C[a] are περὶ δὲ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος καὶ τῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις Ἀριστείδου φύσεως. Then it goes on as in C up to δημοσθενίζει (118, 10), except for two important differences. The first of them is that the parenthesis C 118, 2 τοῦτο γὰρ παρήκαμεν ἐν τοῖς ἄνω εἰπεῖν which refers to B is missing in C[a]. Is this more than mere fortuitousness? It certainly is, and I do not see any reason which prevents us from thinking that the author himself omitted those words because, at a certain time, he wished to loosen the link between C and B (it has appeared on p. 64 ff. that both together represent a certain type of ancient biography). Apparently he had the intention to use again on a larger scale the doctrine which he had propounded in C. If this assumption proves true, C[a] scarcely was to serve as sequel to any other treatise of P. The second difference from C concerns 118, 3 f. This time, however, C[a] is not briefer than C but is increased by an addition: In order to define the χαρακτήρ and the φύσις ἐν τοῖς λόγοις C contents itself with the three adjectives γόνιμος, ἐνθυμηματικός and βίαιος. In C[a], however, before the three adjectives which were taken over from C περιττός is inserted which is often used to characterizing the diction (λέξις) of an author. In another passage the comparison between C and C[a] shows that Sopater did not use C thoughtlessly but revised it carefully for reasons of style. C 118, 10 f. reads as follows: τῇ τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων πυκνότητι δημοσθενίζει καὶ δεύτερα τὰ πρῶτα τίθησι. In C[a] after δημοσθενίζει he makes a long addition which begins with ἐνθυμηματικὸς ὢν πανταχοῦ. Although it did not disturb the construction in C, Sopater felt that it was advisable to avoid the assonance ἐνθυμημάτων—ἐνθυμηματικός and replaced the noun by the synonym ἐπιχειρημάτων.

The manuscripts **r** [1]) and **p**, however, offer a completely divergent version of the beginning of C[a], inasmuch as they omit the opening words up to δημοσθενίζει (153, 10) but increase the list of the adjectives

[1]) The original **R** was replaced by **r**.

ἐνθυμηματικὸς ὢν πανταχοῦ etc. by the adjective περιττός which takes the first place and is followed by the conjunction δέ. Why did they add just περιττός? The answer is that they had knowledge of the beginning of the new redaction of C^a which was based upon C and took the characteristic addition περιττός out of it without repeating the whole beginning in its full extent because it agreed with C. In other words: instead of presenting the redaction planned or, if C^a should appear to be unfinished, left by the author, the two manuscripts content themselves with indicating in a very perfunctory way where and how Sopater made some changes in beginning to disconnect C and B. However interesting it may be to pick out all these details, it still does not help in finding a positive answer to the question as to the purpose of C^a. Now also the conclusion of C^a shows some peculiarity which seems to be puzzling at first glance. We have seen that when C^a received its place at the end of Te. the σφραγίς was transferred from the end of E to the end of C^a. Here the very last place had already been taken by a different brief sentence which reads as follows: ἀλλ' ὥρα λοιπὸν ἐπ' αὐτὴν τῶν ἐδαφίων ἐλθεῖν τὴν ἐξέτασιν. Now, however, it is time to begin with the examination of the texts. There is no reason for considering this sentence an addition of the redactor who placed C^a at the end of P. If it was rather written by Sopater, it suggests that the interpretation of the discourses, the outcome of which is the older scholia, was to follow C^a. The comparison between C and C^a has led to the recognition that in C^a much more emphasis is laid upon Aristeides' λέξις (see p. 72 and the additional detail on p. 103). At the end of Pan. 125, 2 f. Sopater announces that he plans to write a treatise περὶ τῆς 'Αριστείδου λέξεως and postpones the discussion of a certain question for that treatise which will be much more appropriate than Pan. He does, however, not say that the treatise is to follow immediately but expresses himself more vaguely (μετὰ τοῦτο), whereas in Te., turning from T to E, he leaves no doubt that the discussion of the problem of the εἶδος is imminent (141, 3 νῦν). It is true that P does not contain that treatise περὶ λέξεως promised by Sopater; it is, however, no less true that C^a offers the rudiments of such a treatise. I consider, therefore, C^a the very first draft of the treatise περὶ τῆς 'Αριστείδου

λέξεως. It has appeared that he took as basis for that new composition the second part of the biography (B + C) and made the first slight retouches which give a faint idea of what he intended to discuss at greater length. It is quite impossible to find out why Sopater left his work unfinished, whether he lost interest being attracted by different problems of rhetoric or whether some circumstances of his life or his violent death prevented him from carrying on his research on Aristeides. However that may be, from the last sentence of C^a we must infer that the treatise was to be placed at the end of P. After completing the special inquiry into Pan. he apparently felt more tempted, instead of starting the general inquiry into Aristeides' diction, which he had announced, to write a parallel special treatise 'Υπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων which gave him the opportunity to touch also on 'Υπὲρ ῥητορικῆς. This task seemed to him to be the more attractive because he had come to new knowledge concerning 'Υπερ τῶν τεττάρων, which enabled him to go beyond the range of the previous H_1. This became the decisive reason for completing Te. which is well rounded out in itself by the dedication and the σφραγίς. It is just as probable that Sopater published P_1 and Te. apart as it is improbable that he published the whole collection P which as it stands now also comprises the unfinished C^a. It was rather taken care of by a redactor who evidently was at a loss how he should handle C^a. We cannot decide whether he ultimately placed the fragment after Pan. in which the still unwritten treatise περὶ λέξεως is announced by the author or at the end of P. In this case it may well be that he marked the passage of Pan. in which the treatise περὶ λέξεως is announced by some sign referring the reader to the end of the edition. That is, however, a mere surmise which goes beyond the horizon of this analysis. I refrain, therefore, from going farther in this direction. In any case the analysis of C^a has now given the clue of how to handle the fragment in an edition of the Prolegomena. From the methodical point of view it would be wrong, although it seems tempting, to have C^a printed in a second column as text parallel to C. It is true that in this way the reader would be enabled to perceive easily the resemblance between C and C^a and the changes which were made in C^a. This advantage would be more than

counterbalanced by the erroneous impression of C^a which would be unavoidable for the reader if he should see C^s beside C. The alternative is, therefore, to place C^s after Pan. or Te., in both cases with an explanatory note on the character and probable purpose of the fragment. In view of the circumstance that the great majority of the manuscripts places C^s at the end of P it will be advisable to adopt this arrangement but to separate C^s distinctly from the preceding Te.

CONCLUSION

The reader of the analytical interpretation of P which I have undertaken in the first section of this book might wonder why nowhere references to modern discussions of the subject have been given. The answer is that my attempt to elucidate the structure of P in general and to show its particularities is an excursion into unknown territory. Although it is attractive to deal with texts to which no modern scholar has called systematic attention or on which scholars have only touched, it must be said on the other hand that in a case like this the factor of uncertainty is greater than in problems which have been treated more frequently and from different points of view. My analysis has had to accomplish several things: first of all to interpret the various treatises for their own sake and to show their actual significance. It was, however, no less important to throw some light upon the indefatigable research on Aristeides done by an ancient professor of rhetoric who was a zealous advocate of the educational value of Aristeides' orations. He was convinced that his students who were to influence a coming generation would profit much by studying that strange master of rhetoric who in the effort to reproduce the glory of Attic eloquence stood out unexcelled in his own lifetime and had remained pre-eminent in the judgment of later centuries; whose confident title to fame was that he had re-stamped the precious metal of the classical era into a coinage suited to the taste and uses of his own day. The treatises have come down to us in not too good condition and hardly in their original form. Nevertheless the analysis has shown that throughout them the traces of one certain spirit

are still discernible, the spirit of Sopater who did for Aristeides more than his contemporaries but in so doing also was in a favorable position because he had easy access to large exegetical material gathered by previous teachers which is not available to us.

ADDENDUM AD P. 93

The text of the difficult passage 142, 14-16 is hardly in order. The only variant in the manuscripts is αὐτὸ and αὐτῷ, cf. the apparatus criticus. The end is clearly intelligible: "to prove that the men were statesmen". But who or what wished to prove that? If αὐτῶι is right, it denotes Aristeides: by him (= ὑπ'αὐτοῦ) an effort has been made to prove. Apart fiom the awkwardness of expression, however, also the preceding καὶ does not have much point. The second difficulty concerns εἴρηται. By whom and where has it been said? Not by Sopater who in his reference to Pan. 123, 1 ff. is speaking only of the ἀμφίδοξα and ἔνδοξα. The opponents say that the λόγος is ἀγωνιστικὸς because one part is polemical. Sopater's answer is: Yes, that is true but it must be pointed out that this very part — that means implicitly: in no case the whole discourse — (καὶ αὐτὸ) was carefully worked out agonistically in order to show that the men were statesmen. For the construction of ἐσπούδασται ἀποδεῖξαι cf. Soph. O. C. 1143 f. οὐ γὰρ λόγοισι τὸν βίον σπουδάζομεν λαμπρὸν ποιεῖσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς δρωμένοις, for the meaning cf. Plat. Leg. IV 722 d προοίμια θαυμαστῶς ἐσπουδασμένα. If we change εἴρηται to εἰρή<σε>ται, the whole passage runs smoothly: "As to the assertion that some part of the λόγος is agonistic because of its polemic arrangement, it will be said against that this very part has been worked out polemically in order to prove the men being statesmen." The form εἰρήσεται which is familiar also to Demosthenes was misunderstood or not recognized as such and therefore changed in the manuscripts to εἴρηται.

PART TWO

ΤΑ ΠΡΟΛΕΓΟΜΕΝΑ ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΟΥ

THE TREATISE B
(i. e. B proper and C)

CODICES

A =Vat. graec. 1899, cf. p. 34 sq.
K =Vat. graec. 74, cf. p. 47
M=Marc. graec. 423, cf. p. 26 sqq.
P =Paris. Bibl. Nat. graec. 2948, cf. p. 46
R =Vat. graec. 1298, cf. p. 33 sqq. 45. 47 sq.
V =Marc. App. VIII 7, cf. p. 33 sqq. 43
a =Ambr. A. 175 sup., cf. p. 37 sq.
l =Laur. 60, 12, cf. p. 34
p =Vat. Pal. graec. 90, cf. p. 33
O =consensus codicum

singuli codices nominatim afferuntur

1 Τρεῖς φοραὶ ῥητόρων γεγόνασιν, ὧν ἡ μὲν πρώτη ἀγράφως ἔλεγεν, ἧς ἐστι Θεμιστοκλῆς καὶ Περικλῆς καὶ οἱ κατ' ἐκείνους ῥήτορες, ἡ δὲ δευτέρα ἐγγράφως, ἧς ἐστι Δημοσθένης καὶ Αἰσχίνης καὶ 'Ισοκράτης καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς ἡ πραττομένη τῶν ῥητόρων δεκάς. καὶ αὗται οὖν αἱ δύο φοραὶ ἐν 'Αθήναις γεγόνασιν, ἡ δὲ Τύχη καὶ τῆι 'Ασίαι τούτων δωρεῖται φοράν, τρίτην οὖσαν ἐπιστήμην, ἧς ἐστι Πολέμων, 'Ηρώδης καὶ 'Αριστείδης καὶ οἱ κατὰ τούτους τοὺς χρόνους γεγόνασι ῥήτορες.

2 ἤνεγκεν οὖν ἡ τρίτη φορά, λέγω δὴ ἡ τῆς 'Ασίας προελθοῦσα, σοφὸν καὶ θαυμάσιον ἄνδρα τὸν 'Αριστείδην. καὶ γὰρ τῶν πάνυ ἐλλογίμων ἐγένετο καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον καὶ 'σώφρων' λίαν καὶ 'χρημάτων κρείττων', ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς εἶπεν ἐν τῶι 'Υπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων.

3 τούτου λέγουσι πατέρα Εὐδαίμονα, μητέρα δὲ ὡς ἄσημον οὖσαν οὐ προστιθέασιν. ἐγένετο δὲ ἀπὸ 'Αδριανουπόλεως τῆς 'Ιωνίας. 'Αδριανοὶ γὰρ οἱ πολῖται λέγονται. τινὲς δὲ λέγουσιν αὐτὸν Σμυρναῖον, πλανηθέντες

1 τὰ προλεγόμενα ἀριστείδου **M** *Paris. 2952* : προλεγόμενα ἀριστείδου *Vat. 77* : προλεγόμενα τῶν ἀριστείδου λόγων **K** : τὰ προλεγόμενα ἀριστείδου περί τε βίου καὶ τῆς τοῦ λόγου τέχνης **A R p** *in quo in summa pag. addita sunt haec* : ἐνταῦθ' ὁ πλοῦτος τῶν λόγων γνωρίζεται : ἀριστείδου βίος **a** : βίος ἀριστείδου **V** : βίος ἐν ἐπιτομῇ (*sic*) τοῦ ἀριστείδου **l** : προθεωρία εἰς τὸν παναθηναικὸν λόγον τοῦ ἀριστείδου *Vat. 935*
4 ἐγγράφως **A K P R a l p** : ἐγγράφως ἔλεγεν **M V** *Paris. 2952*
καὶ *prius* **O** : *om.* **p**
καὶ *alterum* **O** : *om.* **K P a**
5 σὺν αὐτοῖς **O** : οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς **a**; *cf. p. 53 sq.*
7 λέγοντες τρίτην **M**, *latetne* λέγω δὴ?
ἡρώδης **O** : ἀδημαρώδης **M**
καὶ **O** : *om.* **a**
9 δὴ ἡ **M p** : δὴ **A R V l** : δ' ἡ **K P a** *Paris. 2952 sed corr.* δ' ἡ *in* δὴ ἡ
10 ἀριστείδην **O** : ἀριστείδη **P**
11 σώφρων *et* χρημάτων κρείττων : *alludit ad* 'Υπ. τ. δ' *II 159, 20 et 160, 7 sq. Dind.*
χρημάτων **O** : χρηστῶν **V**
12 ἐν *om.* **P**
τεσσάρων **K R l p**
13 εὐδαίμονον **l**
ἄσημον: η *ex corr.* **P**[2]
14 ἀνδριανουπόλεως **A V l**; *Aristid. XLVII 51 Keil* 'Αδριανοῦ θήρας, *sed 52* 'Ανδριανοῦ θήραι   ἀνδριανοὶ **A l**; *hic locus valde dubius est, cf. p. 54 sq.*
15 πολῖται **M V** : πολῖται (πολῖσαι **l**) αὐτῆς **A K P R a l p**
τινὲς: *cf. Ioann. Sicel. VI 423, 14 Walz* 'Αριστείδου τοῦ Σμυρναίου
λέγουσιν αὐτὸν σμυρναῖον **M V**: σμυρναῖον αὐτὸν λέγουσι(ν) (λέγουσι/**A**) **A K P R a l p**

ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκεῖσε φοιτᾶν τῶι Πολέμωνι διδασκάλωι, ἔπειτα ὅτι καὶ μεγίστην
4 εἰς αὐτὴν εὐεργεσίαν κατεβάλετο. σεισμοῦ γὰρ κατενεγκόντος αὐτὴν ἔγραψε λόγον περὶ αὐτῆς τῆς πτώσεως πρὸς τὸν Ἀντωνῖνον βασιλεύοντα Ῥωμαίων τότε. ὅντινα ἀναγνοὺς Ἀντωνῖνος εὐθέως ἐδάκρυσε καὶ πέμψας ἀνῴκισεν αὐτὴν καὶ σύνοδον ποιήσας ἐν τῆι Ἐφέσωι Ἀσιανῶν ἀνδρῶν
738 D. ἀνενέωσεν αὐτήν. ἐπαιδεύθη καὶ ἐν Ἀθή/ναις τὰ φιλόσοφα.

5 οὗτος δὲ ὁ Ἀριστείδης νέος ὢν πικροτάτην λέγεται νενοσηκέναι νόσον· ἐπιληπτικὸν γὰρ αὐτὸν λέγουσι γεγονέναι, καὶ τὸ τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦτο ἠργηκέναι ἐπί τινα χρόνον. εἶτα ἀπελθὼν ἐν Περγάμωι, ὡς δὴ τοῦ Ἀσκλη-
6 πιοῦ πολὺ ἐκεῖσε φοιτῶντος, καὶ παραμείνας χρόνον ἔτυχεν ἰάσεως. καὶ ὑπὲρ τούτου ἀμείψασθαι τὴν εὐεργεσίαν βουλόμενος ἔγραψεν ἓξ λόγους τοὺς Ἱεροὺς λεγομένους, ἐν οἷς μόνους τοὺς ὀνείρους ἐξηγεῖται, οὓς ἰδὼν ἰάθη. ἐκελεύσθη δὲ παρὰ τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν τριάκοντα λέγειν στίχους, καὶ περαιτέρω μὲν ἐξεῖναι τούτων λέγειν, ἥττονας δὲ οὔ. ὅθεν καὶ ἄπειροι αὐτοῦ λόγοι φέρονται ἐκ ταύτης τῆς προφάσεως.

1 διδασκάλω **O**, γρ. διδασκόμενος *i.m.***a** : διδασκόμενον *Vat. 1336* : τῶι διδασκάλωι *Dind. qui de codd. nihil adnot.*
1-2 μεγίστην εὐεργεσίαν εἰς αὐτὴν **p**
2 κατεβάλετο **O** : κατεβάλλετο **A p**
3 αὐτῆς τῆς πτώσεως **A M V p** : τῆς πτώσεως αὐτῆς **K P a** : τῆς αὐτῆς πτώσεως **R l**, *cf. p. 47*
πρὸς τὸν **O** : καὶ παρὰ τὸν: ν *i. ras.* **l**
3-4 ἀντωνῖνον βασιλεύοντα ῥωμαίων τότε· ὅντινα **A M R V l p** : βασιλέα ἀντωνῖνον· ὃν **K P a**
4 ἀναγνοὺς ἀντωνῖνος **A M R V p** : καὶ ἀναγνοὺς ἀντωνῖνος **l** : ἀντωνῖνος ἀναγνοὺς **K P a**
5 ἀνάκισεν **V** ἀσιανῶν **O** : ἀσιακοῦ **P** : ἀδριανῶν **R l**
5-6 καὶ - αὐτὴν *fort. duplex forma verborum* καὶ - αὐτὴν *quae praecedunt*
7 δὲ **AP R V a l p** : δὴ **K** : *om.* **M**
8 αὐτὸν λέγουσι **O**: λέγουσιν αὐτὸν **M**
καὶ τὸ τῶν λόγων **M V** : καὶ τὰ τῶν λόγων **A K P a p** : κατὰ τὸν λόγον **R l**
post λόγων *add.* σθένος *Paris. 2952*
διὰ τοῦτο *om.* **V**
9 ἐπί τινα χρόνον **O** : ἐπί τινος χρόνου **P**
9-10 ἀσκληπιοῦ: ι *i. ras.* **P**
10-11 καὶ ὑπὲρ τούτου **O** : καὶ ἐπὶ τούτω **l** : ὑπὲρ τούτου (*cum codd.?*) *Dind.*
12 τοὺς - ἐξηγεῖται *om.* **p**
μόνους: μ *ex corr., vid. fuisse* ἐν **P**
13-14 στίχους λέγειν **A** *itemque schol. rec.* Ὑπ. ῥητ. *III 432, 32 D. apud quem falso* στίχων
14 τούτων **O** : καὶ τούτων **R l** : τοῦτο **P**
λέγων **l**
ἥττονας **M R V p** : ἧττον **A K P a**; ἐλάττονας δὲ οὐδαμῶς *schol. l.c.*
15 φέρονται **O** : φαίνονται *Paris. 2952*

7 ἐγένετο δὲ κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους Ἀντωνίνωι τῶι βασιλεῖ καὶ
Μάρκωι. ἐλθόντος δὲ ἐν τῆι Σμύρνηι τοῦ Ἀντωνίνου καὶ πάντων αὐτὸν
τῶν παιδευτῶν τιμησάντων ὁ Ἀριστείδης μόνος οὐκ ἀπήντησεν αὐτῶι.
εἶτα τοῦ Ἀντωνίνου ἐρωτῶντος, ποῦ Ἀριστείδης; ἀπεκρίνατό τις, ὅτι οὐ
8 πάρεστιν· εἰ γὰρ παρῆν, οὐκ ἂν ἐλάνθανεν. καὶ πέμψαντος τοῦ Ἀντωνίνου
πρὸς αὐτὸν ἦλθε λέγων, ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀπήντησα, διότι ἐγὼ οὐ δέομαι,
ὧν οἱ ἄλλοι δέονται, ἀντὶ τοῦ χρημάτων. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἀκούσας τούτων
πλείονα αὐτῶι τῶν ἄλλων δέδωκε χρήματα. ὁ δὲ ἐδέξατο μὲν ὅμως
9 δεδιώς, μὴ διὰ τὸ μὴ λαβεῖν ἐγείρηι καθ' αὑτοῦ τὴν βασιλέως ὀργήν. τοῦ
δὲ Μάρκου ἐπιφοιτήσαντος ταῖς Ἀθήναις ὁ μὲν Ἀδριανὸς ὁ σοφιστὴς
εἰπὼν παραχρῆμα ἐξέπληξεν· πᾶν γάρ, ὃ ὡρίζετο, αὐτοσχεδιάζων ἔλεγεν.
πρὸς τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν ὁ Ἀριστείδης τῶι Μάρκωι παρὼν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν ταῖς

3 παιδευτῶν **O** : παιδευτικῶν **a**
4 ὅτι **O** : ὡς **V** : *om. Dind.*
5 ἂν **l** : *om.* **O**
ἐλάνθανεν **P** : ἐλάνθανε **O**
τοῦ **O** : *om.* **l p**
6 πρὸς αὐτὸν **A K M P R a p** : παρ' αὐτὸν **l** : *om.* **V**
διὰ τοῦτο **A M R V l p** : *om.* **K P a**
διότι ἐγὼ **A M l p** : ὅτι ἐγὼ **R V** : ἐπειδὴ **K P a**
7 ἄλλοι **M R V** : πολλοὶ **A K P a l p**, *cf. p. 48*
ὁ δὲ **A M R V l p** : καὶ ὁ **K P a**
ἀκούσας τούτων **A M P R a p** *et* **K** *sed in hoc ' et* ων *i. ras.* **K**[1] : ἀκούσας τοῦτον **V** : τούτων ἀκούσας **l**
8 πλείονα αὐτῶ (αὐτῶ/ **l**) τῶν ἄλλων **A M R V l p** : πλείω τῶν ἄλλων τούτω **K P a**, *in hoc* υ *ex corr. vid.*
δέδωκε **M V l** : ἔδωκε **A K P R a p**
ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἐβούλετο μὲν ἐδέξατο δὲ δεδιὼς **p**; *ad* ὅμως *melius intellegendum subaudiendum est 'quamquam imperatori dixerat se pecunia non egere', tamen . . .*
9 δεξεὼς **l**
καθ' αὑτοῦ **A** *Paris. 2005* : κατ' αὐτοῦ **O** : καταυτοῦ **P** : κατ' αὐτὴν **A**
βασιλέως **O** : βασιλείας **V** : τοῦ βασιλέως **l** : βασίλειον (ον *sup. lin.*) **A**
10 ἐπιφοιτήσαντος **A M R V l p** : φοιτήσαντος **K P a**
ταῖς ἀθήναις **O** : τὰς ἀθήνας **P**
ἀνδριανὸς **A**
ὁ *alterum* **A M R V l p** : *om.* **K P a**
11 *ante* ἐξέπληξε(ν) *add.* πάντας **K P a**, *sed cf. 114, 2*
ἐξέπληξεν **P R V** : ἐξέπληξε **A K M a l p**
αὐτόσ.σχεδιάζων: *voluitne expungere?* **P**
ἔλεγεν **A R** : ἔλεγε **O**
12 πρὸς τοῦτο **O** : πρὸς τούτω **V** : διὰ τοῦτο **l**

᾿Αθήναις, ὅτι ἡμεῖς τῶν ἐμούντων οὐκ ἐσμεν, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἀκριβούντων καὶ τῶν ἀρεσκόντων. ἀλλ᾿ ὅμως εἰπὼν καὶ αὐτὸς πλέον ἐξέπληξε καὶ ἐτιμήθη σφόδρα.

739 D. **10** βουλόμενος δὲ τότε εἰπεῖν τὸν Παναθηναϊκὸν ἐκω/λύετο παρὰ ῾Ηρώδου τοῦ σοφιστοῦ τοῦ ᾿Αθηναίων ὡς δυνάστου, τοῦτο μέν, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἦν τότε ὁ τὸν θρόνον ἐπέχων τὸν σοφιστικὸν καὶ ἀπὸ ὑπάτων κατήγετο, τοῦτο δέ, ὅτι καὶ Μάρκος αὐτῶι φίλος ἦν. ποτὲ γὰρ εὑρὼν θησαυρὸν ἐδίδου τῶι βασιλεῖ αὐτόν· ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν "κέχρησο" αὐτῶι. αὖθις δὲ προσάγων τῶι βασιλεῖ ἔφη εἶναι ὑπὲρ ἰδιώτην τὸν θησαυρόν· ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς πάλιν εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν· "καὶ κατάχρησαι".

11 μὴ δυνάμενος οὖν διὰ τὸν φθόνον τὸν ῾Ηρώδου, μηχανῆι αὐτὸν μετῆλθεν. ἀναθέμενος γὰρ αὐτῶι ἄλλον Παναθηναϊκὸν εὐτελῆ καὶ ψυχρόν, ὃς καὶ φέρεται, ἠδυνήθη λαβεῖν τὴν ἄδειαν τοῦ λέγειν παρ᾿ αὐτοῦ, νομίσαντος ῾Ηρώδου, ὅτι αὐτὸν μέλλει λέγειν καὶ ἀσχημονεῖν. εἰσελθὼν δὲ εἶπεν τοῦτον τὸν καὶ ἀναγινωσκόμενον καὶ θαυμαζόμενον καὶ πάνυ ηὐδοκίμησεν.

12 λέγεται δὲ Παναθηναϊκός, διότι ἐν τοῖς Παναθηναίοις ἐλέχθη. ἀνάγεται δὲ ὑπὸ τὸ πανηγυρικὸν εἶδος. τὰ κεφάλαια δὲ ἐν τῶι λόγωι εἰσόμεθα. διεῖλε δὲ τὸν λόγον εἰς δ̊, διότι ᾔιδει αὐτούς, ὡς ἐν πανηγύρει,

1 ἐμούντων: ε *i. ras.* **R**
2 τῶν *om.* **A**
4 παρὰ **O** : παρ᾿ **A l**
5 τοῦ ἀθηναίων **M R P** : τοῦ ἀθηναίου **l** : τῶν ἀθηναίων **A K V a p** : τῶν ἀθηνῶν *Vat. 1336*
τότε ὁ **O** : ὁ τότε **p** : ὁ *Paris. 2952*
6 ἄπου πάντων *in fine et init. duorum versuum* **A**
ἀπὸ ὑπάτων κατήγετο: *cf. Philostrat. Vit. Sophist. II 1 (p. 55 Kayser)*
7 *ante* αὐτῶ *add.* λίαν **M**
εὑρὼν θησαυρὸν: *thesaurum ab Herodis patre inventum et imperatori oblatum esse narrat Philostr. l.c. 56 Kayser*
8 εἶπεν *Paris. 2005* : εἶπε **O**
10 εἶπεν **R** : εἶπε **O** καὶ κατάχρησαι **A K M R l** : καὶ κατάχρησο **P V a** : κατακέχρησαι **p**
11 τὸν **A M R V l p** : τοῦ **K P a**
12 αὐτῶ **O** : αὐτὸν **l**
ἄλλον **O** : καὶ ἄλλον **V**
13 ἠδυνήθη **O** : ἐδυνήθη **V** : ἠδυνήθην **P**
14 εἰσελθὼν **O**, *sed* εἰς *postea sup. lin. add.* **R** : ἐλθὼν **A**
εἶπεν **A** : εἶπε **O**
15 καὶ ἀναγινωσκόμενον **O** : ἀναγινοσκόμενον **V**
ηὐδοκίμησεν **A R** : ηὐδοκίμησε **K P V a l** : εὐδοκίμησε **M p**
16 λέγεται **O** : λέγων **V**
17 δ'ὲ ὑπὸ: ε *i. ras.* **P** : δὲ *sup. lin.* **A**
18 εἰς δ̊: *sequitur Menandrum, cf. p. 61*
εἰδεῖ **A** : ἔδει **p** ὡς *om* **p**

μὴ μέλλοντας τοῦ παντὸς ἀκούειν λόγου πολλοῦ ὄντος. περιλαμβάνει δὲ ἐν τούτωι τῶι λόγωι, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, πάσας τὰς ἱστορίας. ἐν γὰρ τῶι πρώτωι λέγει τὰ πρότερα ὧν ἱστόρησεν Ἡρόδοτος, ἐν τῶι δευτέρωι δὲ τὰ Ἡροδότου, ἐν τῶι τρίτωι τὰ Θουκυδίδου, ἐν τῶι τετάρτωι ἅπερ εἶπεν ὁ Ξενοφῶν καὶ ὁ Θεόπομπος. εἰσὶ δὲ τὰ πρῶτα ὧν ἱστόρησεν Ἡρόδοτος τὰ περὶ τοῦ Κελεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἐριχθονίου καὶ Τριπτολέμου καὶ τῶν Ἀμαζόνων καί τινα παλαιὰ πάνυ. ἔτι δὲ εἶπεν Ἡροδότου τὰ Περσικά, τὰ δὲ Θουκυδίδου, τὰ Πελοποννησιακά, τὰ δὲ Ξενοφῶντος, αἱ Ἑλληνικαί, τὰ
740 D. / δὲ Θεοπόμπου, αἱ Φιλιππικαί.

13 ἐπειδὴ δέ τινες λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ἀνταλλάξαι <καὶ> Γαληνόν τὴν τέχνην κατὰ χρησμόν, ἰστέον ὅτι οὐδαμοῦ τούτου μέμνηται, ἀλλ' ἁπλῶς καὶ μάτην λέγουσιν οἱ τοῦτο λέγοντες. ἄλλως τε φαίνεται σβεσθὲν τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς

2 ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν ἐν τούτω τῷ λόγω **p**
2-3 πάσας - ἡρόδοτος *om.* **R**, *i. m. add.* **R**[1]
2 γὰρ: γὰ *i. ras.* **P**
3 πρώτω **O** : πρῶτα **A**
ἱστόρηκεν *Paris. 2952*
3-5 ἐν - ἡρόδοτος *om.* **A**
4 τὰ **O** : τοῦ **V**
τετάρτω **O** : τετάρτω δὲ **K**
εἶπεν ὁ **A K M P V a** : εἶπε **R l p**
5 ὁ **A K P V a** : *om.* **M R l p**
πρῶτα **A K P V a** : πρότερα **M R l p**; *superlativus pro comparativo etiam in schol., cf. p. 50 et III 747, 2 D.* (*infra p. 131, 3*)
6 περὶ **O** : *om.* **V**
τοῦ *prius* **O** : *om.* **R l**
Κελεοῦ: *quamquam recte dicit J. Haury Quibus fontibus Aristid. usus sit in componenda declamat. quae inscrib.* Παναθ., (*Augsburg 1888*) *2 Celei in Panath. mentionem non fieri, res vid. inde explicari, quod Sopater ipse in, schol. III 54, 13 D. Celeum commemoravit*
τριπτολέμου καὶ τῶν ἀμαζόνων **K P V l p** *et* **R** *sed in hoc* τριπτολέμου *i. ras. et* καὶ *postea inser.* **R**[1] : τοῦ πολέμου τῶν ἀμαζόνων **A M a** *et sup. lin. praefixo* γρ. **p**, *ante ras.* **R**
7 ἡροδότου **A a l p** : ἡρόδοτος **K M P R V**; *non confirmatur nominativus schol. III 9, 17 sqq. in quibus et sententia et constructio diversae sunt*
8 αἱ Ἑλληνικαί: *cf. schol. Panath. III 240, 28 D.*
10 ἐπειδὴ **O** : ἐπεὶ **V**
τινες λέγουσιν **A M l p** : λέγουσί τινες **K P R V a**, *cf. p. 50*
αὐτὸν ἀνταλλάξαι **A K M P R a** : ἀνταλλάξαι **V** : αὐτῷ ἀνταλλάξαι **l p**
<καὶ> *Lenz*
γαληνὸν **M P V a** : γαληνῷ **A K R l p**
11 τούτου **A M V p** *et s. l. add.* **l** : τοῦτο *nescio an recte* **R** : *om.* **K P a**
12 ἄλλως: ω *vid. corr. ex* α **P**[1]
τε *sup. lin.* **A**

μαντεῖον κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον τὸ παρέχον αὐτοῖς τὸν χρησμόν, εἴ γε τοῦτο ἐγένετο. ὡς δὲ λέγουσιν, ἐσβέσθη τῶν Φωκέων τότε ἐμπρησάντων
14 αὐτό. ἐπιγενόμενος δὲ Νέρων ὁ βασιλεὺς τότε πάσης ἀσελγείας μεστὸς μεῖζον καὶ λαμπρότερον αὐτὸ κατεσκεύασεν. ὕστερον δὲ αὐτὸς καθεῖλεν αὐτὸ διὰ τόδε· λέγεται, ὅτι εἰσελθόντος εἰς Δελφοὺς εὐτελοῦς τινος καὶ λαβόντος χρησμὸν Νέρων οὐκ ἔλαβεν, ζητῶν καὶ αὐτὸς πυθέσθαι περί τινος. εἶτα ἤρετο ἀνθ' ὅτου, ἡ δὲ Πυθία ἀπεκρίθη·

εὔαδέ μοι χθιζὸς λίβανος κλυτοῦ ἑρμηνῆος.

τοῦτο δὲ ἐσήμαινεν, ὅτι πλεῖόν μοι ἀρέσκει ὁ εὐτελὴς ἑρμηνεὺς θύων εὐτε-
15 λές τι, ὢν δὲ εὐσεβὴς ἢ Νέρων πολλὰ θύσας. ἦν γὰρ πάνυ ἀσελγὴς οὗτος ὁ Νέρων, ὥστε καὶ τῆι μητρὶ συγκαθευδῆσαι καὶ φονεῦσαι αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ τῆς ἀσελγείας ταύτης οὐκ ἀνεχομένην. ἀμέλει καὶ τοιοῦτόν τι πάλιν εἰς αὐτὸν εἶπεν ἡ Πυθία·

1 χρόνον **O** : καιρὸν **l** : καιρὸν *sed i. m.* γρ. χρόνον *Vat. 79*
αὐτοῖς: ῖ *i. ras.* **K**[1]
2 ἐμπρησάντων **O** *sed* γρ. ἐκπερ *ssc.* **a** : ἐμ//πρησάντων : η *i. ras.*; *dubium non est quin fuerit* περσάντων, *de* ἐκ *non constat* **P**; *confudit aetatem bellorum Amphictyonum cum aetate Neronis vel etiam Aristidis, nisi* τότε *delendum aut in* ποτέ *corrigendum est, cf. p. 62 sq.*
3 ἐπιγενόμενος **A M R V l p** : γενόμενος **K P a**
τότε **A M R V l p** : *hic om. et pos. inter* δὲ *et* Νέρων **K P a**
μεστὸς: ε *i. ras.* **K**[1]
4 μεῖζον . . αὐτὸ **K R l p** : μείζον/ . . αὐτὸ : ὁ *vid. corr. ex* ὸ (= ὀν) **A** : μείζονα . . αὐτὸν **M P V a**
αὐτὸ **K** *sed* ὁ *i. ras.* **R l p** : αὐτὸν **A M P V a**
5 λέγεται **O** : λέγων **V**
6 ἔλαβεν **V** : ἔλαβε/ **A** : ἔλαβε **O**
καὶ αὐτὸς **A M R l p** : ὁ αὐτὸς **P V A** : *om.* **K**
8 εὔαδέ (εὔαδε **R**) μοι **M P**[2] **R l p** : . . . ' μοι: *eras. aut evanid., dispic.* δέ, *sed quid in init. fuerit incertum* **A** : ἔαδε μοι **K** : ἔα δὲ μοι **V a** : ἐᾶ δέ μοι **P**
de hoc versu cf. R. Herzog apud E. Horneffer Der junge Platon 155
9 τοῦτο: το *postea inser.* **R**[1]: ο *in fine legitur, cetera eras. aut evanid.* **A**
ante ἐσήμαινεν *add.* μοι *sed om.* μοι *ante* ἀρέσκει **p**
ἐσήμαινεν **R V l p** *et nisi valde fallor* **M**: ἐσήμανεν **A K P a**
ἀρέσκει: ει *corr. ex* ον **P**
ὁ εὐτελὴς **A M** : εὐτελὴς **R l p** : ὁ **K P V a**
10 ὢν δὲ **A M R l p** : ὢν **K P V a**
11 ὥστ(ε) καὶ : τ(ε) *et* κ, *i. ras., fort. primo hab.* ὥστε *et om.* καὶ **K**: καὶ *om. Vat. 1336*
11-12 ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ **K M P V a** : ἐπὶ πολὺ **A R l p**
12 ἀνεχομένην **K M P V a p** : ἀνεχομένης **A R l**
καὶ **O** : γὰρ *Dindorfii* **N**
τοιοῦτόν τι **O** : τοιοῦτό τι **A**
13 εἰς αὐτὸν εἶπεν **O** : εἶπεν εἰς αὐτὸν **A P**[2]
13-p. 117, 1 εἶπεν - μητροκτόνοι *om.* **K P V**, *sed* εἶπεν *add. post* πάλιν *et post*

Νέρων Ὀρέστης Ἀλκμέων μητροκτόνοι.

ἔπαυσε δὲ αὐτὸ τὸ μαντεῖον διὰ τούτου τοῦ τρόπου. πολλὰ ποιοῦντος αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ δυναμένου αὐτὸ σβέσαι παρών τις τῶν ἐμπείρων συνεβούλευσεν αὐτῶι, ὡς λέγεται, Τυφῶνος κεφαλὴν ῥῖψαι ἔσω ἐν τῶι ναῶι. καὶ οὕτως
741 D. ἔπαυ/σεν αὐτό.

16 λέγεται δέ, ὡς ὅτι Ἀριστείδης οὐκ εὐτυχῶς προσήιει τοῖς μαθηταῖς οὐδὲ εἶχε πολλοὺς μαθητάς. ἀμέλει τινὲς εἶπον περὶ αὐτοῦ τὸ ἐπιφερόμενον τοῦτο λεχθέν·

χαίρετ' Ἀριστείδου τοῦ ῥήτορος ἑπτὰ μαθηταί,
τέσσαρες οἱ τοῖχοι καὶ τρία κυψέλια,

[σκαμνία τρία καὶ θρόνος εἷς]. οὐκ ἔστι δέ, ἀλλὰ περὶ ἄλλου τινὸς νεωτέρου Ἀριστείδου μὴ ἔχοντος μαθητάς, ἀλλὰ μόνην τὴν διατριβὴν καὶ τὰ σκαμνία παρά τινος εἰσελθόντος καὶ εὑρόντος αὐτὸν μόνον. οὐ πάνυ δὲ γηραιὸς τέθνηκεν.

αὐτὸν *appinxit* ·/· *et i. m. add.* νέρων ὀρέστης ἀλκμέων μητροκτόνοι **P**^{2}
1 ἀλκμαίων **A M a l** *et* **R** *sed in hoc* αι *i. ras.* : ἀλκμάων **p**
μητροκτόνοι **a** : μητροκτόνος **A R l p** *et ut vid.* **M**; *et pluralis et singularis legitur apud Cass. Dion. LXI 16, 2*^{2} *sed sing. solis in Exc.Vat., pluralem maluit Boissevain, plural. hab. Philostrat. Vit. Sophist. p. 2 Kayser qui eundem versum trimetrum affert inter dicta quaedam dactylica* τοῦ Πυθίου, *cf. p. 51 et 61*
2 αὐτὸ **O** : αὐτὸς **K** *Vat. 935* : *fort. verba* τὸ μαντεῖον *ut glossa delenda sunt, cf. p. 116, 5*
πολλὰ **O** : πολλὰ δὲ **l**
4 αὐτῶ ὡς λέγεται **O** : αὐτό· λέγεται δὲ **V**
ῥῖψαι ἔσω **O** : ἔσω ῥῖψαι **A**
5 ἔπαυσεν **O** : ἔσωσεν (σεν *sup. lin.*) **M**, ἔσβεσεν (σεν *sup. lin.*) **M**^{2}
αὐτὸο(σ?) **p**, *cf. 2*; *est ne coniungenda haec historia quae narratur de Typhonis capite a Nerone coniecto, cum Plut. De fac. in orb. lun. 30.945B, ubi Typhonem Delphos cepisse et oraculum turbavisse dicit*: ὅ τε Δελφοὺς κατασχὼν καὶ συνταράξας τὸ χρηστήριον ὕβρει καὶ βίαι Τυφών?
6 ὡς **O** : καὶ *Paris. 2952*
ὅτι **O** : ὁ **K**
προσή(ι)ει **K P V a l p** : προσείη **A M R**
7 εἶπον περὶ αὐτοῦ **A R l p** : περὶ αὐτοῦ εἶπον **K M P V a**
7-8 τὸ ἐπιφερόμενον τοῦτο **A K P R a l p** : τοῦτο τὸ ἐπιφερόμενον **M** : *om.* **V**
9-10 *de disticho cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Der Rhetor Aristeides, S. Ber. Ak. Berl. 1925, 347, 2 et supra p. 63, 1*
9 χαίρετ' **A p** : χαίρετε **O**
10 κυψέλια **R l** : κυψέλλια **O**
11 σκαμνία **A M R a l p** : σκάμνα **K P V**
σκαμνία - εἷς *ut glossam uncis seclus. Lenz*
13-14 οὐ πάνυ δὲ γηραιὸς τέθνηκεν (τέθνηκε **K P V**) **K M P V a**, *non hab.* **A R l p**, *cf. p. 63 sqq.*

17 περὶ δὲ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος καὶ τῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις Ἀριστείδου φύσεως —
τοῦτο γὰρ παρήκαμεν ἐν τοῖς ἄνω εἰπεῖν — ἤδη μὲν Λογγῖνος καὶ πάντες
οἱ κριτικοὶ πολλὰ προειρήκασιν, ὡς γόνιμος, ὡς ἐνθυμηματικὸς τυγχάνει
καὶ βίαιος καὶ καθόλου τὸν Δημοσθένην μιμούμενος. ὅμως δὲ καὶ παρ'
ἡμῶν ὀλίγα πρὸς τὸ παρὸν προστεθήσεται.
18 φιλότιμός ἐστιν ὁ ἀνὴρ πανταχοῦ καὶ χαίρων καιναῖς ὑποθέσεσιν
καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πρώτους τῶν παλαιῶν ταῖς ῥητορείαις μαχόμενος, Ἰσοκρά-
την Δημοσθένην Θουκυδίδην Ἡρόδοτον, καὶ πρὸς τὸν κορυφαῖον τῶν φιλο-
19 σόφων Πλάτωνα. οὗτος οὖν ταῖς ὕλαις ἐφαμίλλους πλέκει τοὺς λόγους
καὶ τῆι τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων πυκνότητι δημοσθενίζει καὶ δεύτερα τὰ
πρῶτα τίθησι πολλάκις καὶ τοῖς πρώτοις ὡς δευτέροις μάχεται καὶ
20 σχημάτων ἀγωνιστικῶν εὑρετὴς γεγένηται. πᾶσαν δὲ τὴν γῆν ἀσφαλὴς ὡς
742 D. κύριος ἐπερχόμενος οὐδὲν ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας ἐπεσύρατο κενὸν ἢ κοῦφον ἢ

1 περὶ δὲ: *cf. p. 66 sq.*
τῆς *corr. ex* τοῖς **A**
ἀριστείδου φύσεως **A K M P R p** : φύσεως ἀριστείδου **1** *Vat. 1336* : φύσεως **V**
2 ἐν τῷ ἄνω **1**
ἄνω//εἰπεῖν *Vat. 77*
4-5 δὲ πρὸς τὸ παρὸν ὀλίγα καὶ παρ' (πρὸς *Vat. 1336*) ἡμῶν **K** *Vat. 1336*
6 πανταχοῦ **A M R 1 p** : *om.* **K P V a**
ὑποθέσεσιν **A** *Paris. 2005* : ὑποθέσεσι **O**
10 δεύτερα **O** : δεύτερον **P**
11 πολλάκις **O** : πολλ' ἃ **P**
καὶ τὰ πρῶτα (κατὰ τὰ πρῶτα *Vat. 935*) ὡς δευτέροις μάχεται **R 1** *Vat. 935*, κέχρηται $\mathbf{R}^2$
μάχεται **O** : κέχρηται **p**
12 σχημάτων ἀγωνιστικῶν εὑρετὴς *ex* C^e (*p. 154, 17 sq.*) *corr. Lenz* : σχημάτων ἀγῶνι ἔτι ὑπηρέτης **A M R** *et* **1** *qui* ὑπηρέτης *i. m. add.* : σχημάτων ἐναγωνίων (ἐν ἀγωνίων **P**) ὑπηρέτης **K P a p** : σχημάτων ἀγῶνι ἔτι καὶ ὑπηρέτης **V**, καὶ σχημάτων ἐναγωνίων κέχρηται *i. m.* $\mathbf{V}^2$: σχημάτων ἐναγωνίων ἔτι ὑπηρέτης *Paris. 2952* : σχημάτων ἀγωνιστὴς καὶ ὑπηρέτης *Vat. 935*
πᾶσαν δὲ τὴν γῆν **A R V 1 p**, *cf. p. 69 sqq.* : τὴν δὲ γῆν γνώμην **M** : τὴν δὲ . . . . **P** *qui utrum spatium reliquerit vacuum an aliquid scripserit quod subtiliter eras.* m^2 *incertum est*, γῆν δὲ πᾶσαν $\mathbf{P}^2$: τὴν δὲ γῆν *Paris. 2952*
12-13 ἀσφαλὴς ὡς κύριος **A V** : ὡς κύριος ἀσφαλὴς **M P** *qui* ` *corr. ex* ~, *et Paris. 2952* : ἀσφαλῶς ὡς κύριος **R 1 p** *qui* κύριος *fort. radendo corr. ex* κυρίως
13 ἐπερχόμενος **V** : ἐρχόμενος **A** : ἐχόμενος **R 1** : ἀρχόμενος **M** *Paris. 2952* : διερχόμενος **p** : ἀρχῆν δὲ **P**, ἀ *fort. corr, ex* ἐ, ^ *ssc. et* δὲ *inser.* $\mathbf{P}^2$, η *vid. ex corr.*
12-13 πᾶσαν - ἐπερχόμενος: τὴν δὲ λέξιν κύριος ἀσφαλὴς ἀρχαῖος σαφὴς *ex* C^e (*p. 154, 1 sq.*) **K a**
13 ἐπεσύρατο **A R 1 p** : εὕρατο **M P V a** : ἐπεφέρετο *Vat. 935* : ἔχων (*om.* ἐκ τῆς ἀσίας) **K**
κενὸν **A M R V 1 p** : καινὸν **P a**, ε *sup.* αι *ssc.* $\mathbf{P}^2$: ὑπόκενον *ex* C^e **K**

εὔηθες οὐδὲ ταῖς τροπικαῖς τῶν λέξεων ὡς ἔτυχε χρώμενος οὐδὲ φαινόμενος τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν ἐπιπολῆς, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ βαθὺς ὢν πανταχόθεν καὶ τῆς λέξεως πλείονα διδοὺς τῶι νοεῖν. ὃ γὰρ ὡς ἴδιον Δημοσθένει προσὸν κατενοήσαμεν, τοῦτο ἐπ' ἀκριβείας τῶν νεωτέρων σοφιστικῶν ἀνδρῶν αὐτὸς μόνος μεμίμηται. κινῶν γὰρ οὐκ ἀναπαύει τὸν νοῦν, ἀλλὰ τῶι γονίμωι τῆς φύσεως χρῆται.

2 τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν **O** : ἐν τοῖς τυγχάνουσιν **P**
ἐπιπολῆς **R V** *in quo circumflexus sup.* ι *deletus est et* **l** : ἐπὶ πολῆς **A p** : ἐπιπολλῆς *Vat. 935* : ἐπιπόλοις **M** : ὡς ἐπιπολῆς **K a**
3 τῶ νοεῖν **A R l p** : τὸ νοεῖν **M P V a** : ἐννοεῖν **K** *Paris. 2005 Vat. 77*
4 κατενοήσαμεν: *cf. p. 69* κατενοίσαμεν (*sup. et sub* ο *et sub* σ *ras.*): *quid ante ras. habuerit incertum est* **P**
5 κινῶν **R l** : νικῶν **O**
6 γονύμω **P**
χρῆται **K V a** : χρᾶται **A M P R l p**
οὐ πάνυ δὲ γηραιὸς τέθνηκεν (-κε **p**) *in fine add.* **A R l p** : *non hab.* **K M P V a**, *cf. ad 117, 13-14*

THE TREATISE PAN

CODICES

A =Vat. graec. 1899, cf. p 34 sq.
B =Vat. Barberin. graec. 237
K =Vat. graec. 74, cf. p. 47
M=Marc. graec. 423, cf. p. 26 sqq.
P =Paris. Bibl. Nat. graec. 2948, cf. p. 46
V =Marc. App. VIII 7, cf. p. 33 sqq. 43
a =Ambr. A. 175 sup., cf. p. 37 sq.
m=Marc. Graec. 424, cf. p. 32
p =Vat. Pal. graec. 90, cf. p. 33
r =Vat. graec. 1298 (**R**) m. rec., cf. p. 33 sq. 45. 47 sqq.
v =Vat. graec. 76, cf. p. 6 sq.
O =consensus codicum

singuli codices nominatim afferuntur

1 Ὁ Παναθηναϊκὸς Ἀριστείδου συμβαίνουσαν οὐκ ἔχει τῆι προσηγορίαι τὴν τέχνην. ὅσα μὲν γὰρ ἡ κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν ὑπόθεσις ἀπαιτεῖ, λέγω δὴ τὴν ἑορτὴν καὶ τὴν τῶν Ἀθηναίων πανήγυριν, παρῆκε διόλου, μήτε τῆς ἑορτῆς ἐπαινέτης μήτε τῶν δρωμένων γενόμενος, ἀφειδῶς δὲ ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐγκώμιον ἀφείς, οὐχ, ὅπερ ἡ τῆς πανηγύρεως ἀπῄτει διαίρεσις, ἀλλ' ὅπερ ἡ τῶν ἐγκωμίων, πεπλήρωκε χρεία, τῆς τε χώρας ἐκφράζων τὴν θέσιν καὶ τοῖς τῆς γῆς ὡραΐζόμενος κάλλεσι καὶ πανταχοῦ μὲν αὔξησιν ἐκτιθείς, πομπεύων δὲ κατὰ μέρος ἐν πᾶσι καὶ ταῦτα λέγων καὶ πρὸς ἄσκησιν τοῖς νέοις ἐκτείνων τὸ σύγγραμμα τὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς παρῆκεν ἐγκώ-
2 μιον, τὸν σοφιστὴν Ἰσοκράτην μιμούμενος. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἑαυτοῦ Παναθηναϊκὸν ἐπέγραψε τὸν λόγον, οὕτως Ἀριστείδης τὴν ἀρχὴν παρ' ἐκείνου λαβὼν καὶ τὴν μεταχείρισιν καὶ αὐτὴν ὡς εἰπεῖν τὴν ὕλην καθαρώτερον ἐξείργασται τὴν ὑπόθεσιν. καίτοι δοκοῦσιν ἀμφότεροι οὐ πρὸς τὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς σημαινόμενον ἀφορῶντες, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ πάντων ὁμοῦ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐγκώμιον τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν ταύτην ἐπιγράψαι τὸν λόγον καὶ δηλοῦν ἐθέλειν σαφῶς διὰ τῆς προσηγορίας τοῦ λόγου τὴν δύναμιν.
743 D. 3 ἃ δέ τινες περὶ τῶν ἀντιθέσεων ἐγκαλοῦσι τῶι σοφιστῆι, φέρε μετὰ

1 προλεγόμενα τοῦ παναθηναικοῦ **A B K M** : τὰ προλεγόμενα τοῦ παναθηναικοῦ **p** : προθεωρία τοῦ παναθηναικοῦ **V** : ὑπόθεσις τοῦ παναθηναικοῦ *Paris. 2952* : περὶ τοῦ παναθηναικοῦ *Vat. 1336*
2 ὁ **B M P V a p r** : *om.* **A** : *non hab. sed cum aliis locis in initio scripserit* ρολεγόμενα *et* ερὶ *et* ριστείδης, *vix dubium est quin a rubricatore* ὁ *addi voluerit librarius* **K**
τῆ(ι) **O** : τὴν **r**
3 ὅσα **A B K M P V a** : ὅτι **p r**
δὴ **O** : δὲ *et ssc.* η *Vat. 1336*
5 γενόμενος **O** : γινόμενος **a**
5-6 εἰς τὸ . . ἐγκώμιον **O** : τοῖς . . ἐγκωμίοις **M**
6 τῆς πανηγύρεως **O** : περὶ τῆς πανηγύρεως **M**
διήγησις *sed i. m.* διαίρεσις **B**
7 χρεία *delere vult Hönigswald*
8 γῆς: γῆ *i. ras.* **P**
κάλλεσι· : · *i. ras., fuitne* ιν? **P** : κάλλεσιν **A** *Paris. 2005*
11-12 αὐτοῦ τὸν παναθηναικὸν **B**
13 μεταχείρισιν: ι *i. ras.* **M** *et ut vid.* **P** : *ex* η *corr.* **A** : *i. ras. m. rec.* **K** : μεταχείρησιν **p r**
16 -ναίων *incip.* **m**
τῶ λόγω *Paris. 2005*
18 ἐγκαλοῦσι: *cf. schol. III 286, 9 sqq. D.*
post σοφιστῆ *add.* ἀριστείδη **M**

ταῦτα γυμνάσωμεν. ἁπάντων, φασίν, εἰδότων, ὡς Ἰσοκράτης φησίν,
ὅτι δεῖ τοὺς μὲν εὖ λέγειν τινὰς βουλομένους πλείω τῶν ὑπαρχόντων
αὐτοῖς ἀγαθῶν τὰ προσόντα ἀποφαίνειν, τοὺς δὲ κατηγοροῦντας τἀν-
αντία τούτων ποιεῖν, Ἀριστείδης τοῖς προσοῦσιν ἐγκωμίοις τῆι πόλει
κατηγορίαν συνέπλεξεν, τὰς περὶ Μηλιέων καὶ Σκιώνης ἀντιθέσεις
συντάξας τῶι λόγωι. καὶ γὰρ δὴ ἐγκλήματα καὶ διαβολάς, οὐκ ἔπαι-
4 νον ὡς ἐγκωμιαζομένοις προσέφερεν. πρὸς οὓς τήνδε προχείρως ἐροῦμεν
τὴν λύσιν, ὅτι δεῖ ἁπανταχόθεν τὸν τινὰ ἐγκωμιάσαι βουλόμενον καὶ τὰ
νομιζόμενα τιθέναι κατηγορήματα καὶ ταῦτα λύειν, ἐάν γε προχείρως ἔχηι
τὰς λύσεις. καὶ οὗτος μὲν ὁ λόγος κοινότερος· ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἂν εἴη πρὸς τὸ
ζητούμενον χαριέστερος, ἐὰν λέγωμεν, ὡς τῶν ἐγκωμίων τὰ μέν ἐστιν
5 ἄγαν ἔνδοξα καὶ ὁμολογούμενα ἀγαθά, τὰ δὲ ἀμφίδοξα. ἔνδοξα μὲν τὰ τῶν
θεῶν ἐγκώμια καὶ τὰ τῶν βασιλέων τυχόν — οὐδὲ γὰρ τολμῶμεν ἄτο-
πον περὶ τούτων εἰπεῖν — ἀμφίδοξα δὲ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων, οἷς

1 γυμνάσωμεν: *cf. Preisigke Sammelbuch 2941, 12 (to investigate: Liddell-Scott) saec. VI; cf. Et. M. 243, 5* γυμνάσαι λέγεται καὶ εἰς φῶς ἀγαγεῖν
φασὶν **K V p r** : φησὶν **B M a m** : φησὶ **P** : φύσει **A**, *cf. p. 73, 1*
Ἰσοκράτης: *XI 4*
φησὶ **A P**
5 κατηγορίαν **O** : κατηγορίας *Dind.*
συνέπλεξεν **V** *et ut vid.* **A** : συνέπλεξε *cett.*
μηλιέων: ε *i. ras. vid.* **V** : *i. ras. m. rec.* **K** : μηλῐ/έων **P** : μηλέων **r** : μηλιαίων **M**
σκιώνης **O** : σκιωωναῖ *sed vid. voluisse corrigere* σκιωναίων *in* σκιώνης *Paris. 2005*: σκιωναίων **p r** *(ex Panath. I 286, 9 Dind. vel ex 123, 13 sq.)*
ἀντιθέσεις: σεις *corr. m. rec., quid fuerit incertum* **K**
6 συντάξας τῶ λόγω ἀντιθέσεις **B**
6-7 ὡς ἐγκωμιαζομένοις οὐκ ἔπαινον *Paris. 2005*
ἐπαίνοις **B**
7 προσέφερεν **A** : προσέφερε **O**
8 ἁπανταχόθεν τὸν τινὰ **V** : πανταχόθεν τὸν τινὰ **B K P a m** : τὸν τινὰ πανταχόθεν **A M p r**
βουλόμενος **P**
9 ἐάν γε **O** *et ex corr.* **V** : ἐάν τε **M** *et ante corr.* **V**
προχείρους *Vat. 1336*
ἔχει **V**
10-11 τὰ ζητούμενα *Vat. 1336*
11 χαριέστερον **a**
λέγομεν **V**, *cf. ad 9*
12 ὁμολογούμενα - ἀμφίδοξα: *cf. schol. III 286, 32 D. et* H_2 *(infra p. 159, 6 sq. = III 436, 25 D.)*
μὲν **K P V a m** : μὲν γὰρ **A M P r** : δὲ **B**
13-14 ἄτοπον **O** : ἀτοπόντι **p r**
περὶ τούτων ἄτοπον *Vat. 914*
14 οἷς *i. ras.* **K**[1] : ὡς *Paris. 2005*

πῆ μὲν ἔνδοξα, πῆ δὲ ἄδοξα τυγχάνει τὰ πράγματα. ἐάν μὲν οὖν ἔνδοξα θέλωμεν ποιῆσαι τὰ κατὰ φύσιν ἀμφίδοξα, τότε δεῖ τὰ μὲν ὁμολογούμενα ἀγαθὰ συναύξειν τῶι λόγωι, τὰ δὲ μέσα δεικνύναι διὰ τῆς μεταχειρίσεως ἔνδοξα, τὰ δὲ διαβολῆς καὶ κατηγορίας ἐχόμενα εἰς ἔπαινον μετατιθέναι ταῖς λύσεσιν, ἵνα ὁ σκοπὸς πανταχόθεν ἡμῖν ἀνύηται, τὸ κατασκευάσαι διόλου τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἔνδοξον. Δημοσθενικὸν δὲ τὸ τοιοῦτον θεώρημα, τὸ τὰς καθ' ἡμῶν ἀντιθέσεις εἰς τοὐναντίον μετατιθέναι τῆι τέχνηι.
6 ὃ γὰρ Ἀριστείδης ποιῆσαι βουλόμενος καὶ τὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἔνδοξον κατασκευάσαι σπουδάζων ἐγκώμιον, ὅσα μὲν ἦν ὁμολογούμενα τῶν ἀγαθῶν, οἷον τὰς παρὰ τῶν θεῶν τιμάς τε καὶ δωρεὰς καὶ τὰς εὐεργεσίας
744 D. αὐτῶν / καὶ τὰς ὑποδοχὰς τῶν ἱκετευόντων αὐτούς, ἄγαν ἐπήυξησεν· ὅσα δὲ μέ‹σα, οἷον› τὰ πολέμων λέγω καὶ τῶν τοιούτων, πρὸς τὸ κρεῖττον μετεχειρίσατο· ἃ δὲ διαβολὴν ἐποίει τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἀπὸ Μηλιέων καὶ

1 πῆ .. πῆ A K M P V a m r : ποῖ .. ποῖ B p, *cf. infra p. 140, 11 sq.*
ἔνδοξα: ἕν *ex corr. m. rec.* K
2 δεῖ: εῖ *ex corr. m. rec.* K: δὴ B
3 συνάξειν *ssc.* αυ, *i. m. repet.* αυ p
λόγω: λο *et ut vid.* γ *ex corr., i. m.* λ p
μεταχειρίσεως: ι *ex corr. m. rec.* K : μεταχειρήσεως A B V p r
4 διαβολῆ P
καὶ κατηγορίας ἐχόμενα B K M P V a m : ἐχόμενα καὶ κατηγορίας A p r
ἔ/παινον K
5 ἵνα: *incip.* v
ὁ σκοπὸς A M V p r v : σκοπὸς B K P a m
post σκοπὸς *add.* πάλιν A v
σκοπαπανταχόθεν *Vat. 1336*
πανταχόθεν ἡμῖν O : ἡμῖν πανταχόθεν B
5-6 κατασκευάσαι διόλου A M V p r v : διόλου κατασκευάσαι B K P a m
6 τὸ τοιοῦτον O : τοιοῦτον V : qὸὶ(?) τοιοῦτον *Paris. 2005*
7 τὰς: ὰ *i. ras. m. rec.* K
8 ὃ K V m : ὁ A B M P a p r v
γὰρ O : καὶ K m
post βουλόμενος *add.* τοῦτο A p v
9 /εγκώμιον K
μὲν *om.* m *Paris. 2005*
11 ὑποδοχὰς A M p r v *et ita trecentis locis* Σ, γρ. ἐνδοχὰς *i. m.* p : εὐχὰς B K P V a m, *cf. p. 74, 2*
12 μέ‹σα, οἷον› τὰ *Lenz*: μετὰ O
fort. τὰ τοιαῦτα κρεῖττον : ει *i. ras.* K[1]
13 μετεχειρίσατο *corr. ex.* μεταχειρίσατο B : μετεχειρήσατο A *ut vid. et* p r
13-p. 124, 1 μηλιέως καὶ σκιωνέως P a, *cetera orthographica similiter atque supra (p. 122, 5)*

Σκιωναίων, ἐξ ἀντιθέσεων ἐν μέσωι δεξάμενος, οὕτω διέλυσεν, ἵνα παντα-
7 χόθεν τὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἔνδοξον φαίνηται πρόσωπον. ὅτι γὰρ κἂν τῆι θέσει τῆς ἀντιθέσεως παρ' Ἰσοκράτους τὸν λόγον ἐδέξατο, δῆλον τοῖς τὸ Βουσίριδος ἐγκώμιον ἀνεγνωκόσι σὺν τέχνηι. καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος πανταχόθεν ἔνδοξον κατασκευάσαι θέλων τὸ πρόσωπον τὴν στοχαστικὴν ἀντίθεσιν ἔθηκεν, οὕτως λέγων· «Ἀλλ' ἄδηλον, εἰ Βούσιρις τὴν τοιαύτην πολιτείαν τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις κατέστησεν». ἣν ἔλυσε πάλιν στοχαστικῶς εἰπών· «Οὐδένα ἄλλον εἰκὸς ἦν ταῦτα νομοθετῆσαι ἢ τὸν ἐκ Ποσειδῶνος μὲν γεγονότα» καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον.

8 ὅτι δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ὁ λόγος φιλότιμος καὶ τὸ τῶν πανηγυρικῶν εἶδος διόλου τετήρηκεν σεμνοτάτην φράσιν διδούς, καὶ ὡς αὐξητικὸς ἐν πᾶσι τυγχάνει τοῖς πράγμασιν τὴν Δημοσθένους βίαν μιμούμενος — οὐ γὰρ ἀρκεῖ τὰ τῶν ἐγκωμίων τῆι φύσει, ἀλλά τι

1 ἀντιθέσεων **O** : ἀντιθέσεως **A**
δεξάμενος : δ *ex corr., fuit fort.* τι **p**
2 τὸ **O** : *om.* **p**
κἂν **O** : καὶ **v**
2-3 κἂν τῇ θέσει **O** : κἀντιθέσει **B**
3 λόγον **B K M P V a m** : λόγον *et ssc.* ζῆλον **r** : ζῆλον **A p v**
ἐδέξατο : δέξατο *i. ras.* **K**
3-4 τοῖς τὸ βουσίριδος ἐγκώμιον **A M m p r v** : τοῖς τὸ τοῦ βουσίριδος ἐγκώμιον **K a** : τοῖς τοῦ τὸ βουσίριδος ἐγκώμιον **P V** : τοῖς τοῦ βουσίριδος ἐγκώμιον **B** : τοῖς τοῦ βουσίριδος τὸ ἐγκώμιον *Vat. 914*
4 ἀνεγνωκόσι **O** : ἐγνωκόσι **m**
τέχνη **O** : τῇ τέχνῃ **M**; *ad* σὺν τέχνηι *cf. Te. 25 (infra p. 139, 6)*
5 ἔνδοξον *om.* **A**
κατασκευάσαι θέλων **A M p r v** : θέλων κατασκευάσαι **B K P V a m v**
6 οὕτως **B K M P** : οὕτω **A V a m p r v**
λέγων: *Isocr. XI 10*
τὴν **O** : *om.* **V**
7 τοῖς **O** : *om.* **B**
κατέστησεν: ε *prius i. ras.* **K**
10 ἐπαγγελίαν: ελί *i. ras.* **K** : ἀπαγγελίαν **M** *Vat. 914*
φιλότιμος: *cf. infra C^a 2 (p. 153, 6)*
11 εἶ^{Δº} ε'ῦ διόλο **P** *sed* º *et* ˉ *sup.* ευ **P²**
τετήρηκεν **A** : τετήρηκε **O**
σεμνοτάτην **A M V a p r v** : σεμνότητι **B K P m**
ὡς *om. Paris. 2005*
12 αὐξητικο/ς **A** : αὐξητικὸν *Vat. 914*
πράγμασιν **A** *Paris. 2005 Vat. 1336* : πράγμασι **O**
δημοσθένους **O** : τοῦ δημοσθένους **v**
13 *parenthesin distinxit Lenz*
ἀρκεῖ τὰ **O** : ἀρκεῖται **K v**

κἀκ τῆς τέχνης προστίθησιν εἰς μέγεθος ἔτι μεῖζον ἐπαύξων τὰ κατορθώματα — μετὰ τοῦτο δεικνύναι, τὸ σαφὲς τῆς λέξεως ἐπεξιόντες, παρατηρήσομεν.

1 κἀκ **O** : κατὰ **P**
μεῖζον **O** : μείζων **V**
2 γρ. μετὰ τοῦτο *i. m.* **p**, μετὰ τὸ **p** : μετὰ τὸ *et sup.* τὸ *ssc.* τούτων **r** : μετὰ τούτων **A B K P V a m v** : μέγα τούτων **M**; *ad* μετὰ τοῦτο *respic.* *C*[a] *p. 153, 2* τοῦτο γὰρ παρήκαμεν ἐν τοῖς ἄνω εἰπεῖν
3 παρατηρήσωμεν **p**

THE TREATISE TE.

CODICES

A =Vat. graec 1899

B =Barberin. graec. 237

K =Vat. graec. 74

P =Paris. Bibl. Nat. graec. 2948

R =Vat. graec. 1298

V =Marc. App. VIII 7

b =Pal. graec. 29

m=Marc. graec. 424

p =Pal. graec. 90

v =Vat. graec. 76

1 Ἀριστείδης ὁ σοφιστὴς ἐντυχὼν τῶι Γοργίαι τῶι Πλάτωνος καὶ τοὺς τῶν Ἀθηναίων ῥήτορας διαβαλλομένους εὑρών, τῶι πιθανῶι πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀναγκαίων λύσιν χρησάμενος τὸν λόγον συνέθηκεν, προσποιούμενος
745 D. περιτρέ/πειν εἰς τοὐναντίον ἃ Πλάτων μετ᾽ ἀποδείξεων εἴρηκεν.

2 ἵνα δέ σοι σαφέστερον, Ἀλέξανδρε τιμιώτατε, τήν τε τοῦ Πλάτωνος καὶ τὴν τοῦ σοφιστοῦ μεταχείρισιν ἐκκαλύψωμεν, περὶ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ ὀλίγα πρὸ τῆς ὑποθέσεως προλάβωμεν, οἷός ἐστιν ὁ πολιτικὸς ὑπογράφοντες.

3 ὁ πολιτικὸς πάντων ἐστὶν τῆι πόλει τῶν εἰς διοίκησιν αὐτῆι προσηκόντων θεωρητικός, ἐνεργῶν μὲν οὐδέν, ἐπιτάττων δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις πᾶσι καὶ κατ᾽ ἀρετὴν ἔχων τὸ τέλειον ἐν ἑαυτῶι καὶ οὐ κατά τι ἐνδεὴς

8 περὶ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ, τίς ἐστιν οὗτος· ὅτι ὁ κατ᾽ ἀρετὴν τέλειος *i. m.* **p**

1 *de titulo cf. p. 80 sqq.* προλεγόμενα ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων **m** ὑπὲρ *Vat. 77* : προλεγόμενα τοῦ περὶ ῥητορικῆς σωπάτρου **B** : ὑπόθεσις τοῦ ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς *Paris. 2952* : ὑπόθεσις τῶν ὑπὲρ ῥττορικῆς λόγων *Vat. 1336* : ρολεγόμενα τῶν περὶ ῥητορικῆς λόγων καὶ τῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν τεσσάρων **K** : ὑπόθεσις ὑπὲρ τῶν τεσσάρων **V** : προλεγόμενα τῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν τεσσάρων **A v** : εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ *i. m.* **p** *in quo praeced.* H_1
2 ὁ σοφιστὴς **K P R V b m** : σοφιστὴς **A v** : ὁ ῥήτωρ **p** *et ssc. m. rec.* **R** : *om.* **B**
ἐντυχὼν // γοργία: *eras.* τῶ **R**
γοργία τῶ πλάτωνος **A K P R b m p v** : γοργία τοῦ πλάτωνος **V** : πλάτωνος γοργία **B**
4 χρησάμενος **O** : προσχρησάμενος **V**
συνέθηκεν **A R** : συνέθηκε **O**
προσποιούμενος **O** *et m. rec.* **R** : ποιούμενος **R**
5 περιτρέπειν **O** : ρι *fort. i. ras. vel arras.* **v** : παρατρέπειν *Paris. 2952* : προτρέπειν **A**
εἰς **O** : πρὸς **A v**
ἀποδείξεων **O** : ἀποδείξεως **A**
7 μεταχείρισιν *et* μεταχείρησιν *codd.*, η *corr. in* ι *nonnulli, sed singula afferre non iam opus est, cf. ad Pan. p. 121, 13 et 123, 3*
ἐκκαλύψωμεν μεταχείρισιν **B**
ὀλίγα *hic om. et ante* 8 προλάβωμεν *pos.* **A R p v** *et ante* ὑπογράφοντες *repet.* **p**
8 προλάβομεν **B K**, *corr. m. rec.* **K**
ἐστὶ/ν: ι *i. ras.* **K**
9 ἐστὶν **A** : ἐστὶ **O**
9-10 τῇ πόλει τῶν εἰς διοίκησιν αὐτῆι προσηκόντων **B K P V b m** : τῶν εἰς διοίκησιν τῇ πόλει προσηκόντων **A R p v**
10 θεωρητικὸς: ο *ex corr. m. rec.* **K**
11 πᾶσι **B K P V b m** : ἅπασι **A R p v**
τὸ τέλειον **O** : τὸ τέλος **p**

οὐδὲ εἰδὼς μὲν ἐπιτάξαι τῶι στρατηγῶι, ῥήτορι δὲ οὔ, καὶ νόμους μὲν θεῖναι δυνάμενος, ῥητορεύειν δὲ ἢ δικάζειν ἀδυνατῶν. ἔχων γὰρ τὸ τέλειον ἐν ἑαυτῶι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις πρὸς ὑπηρεσίαν χρώμενος ἀπροσδεής ἐστι τῶν καλῶν. εἰ γὰρ αὐτός τι ἐνεργοίη, οὐκέτι πολιτικὸς ὁ τοιοῦτος.

4 ὡς ἐν εἰκόνι γὰρ εἰπεῖν, βασιλεύς ἐστι, καὶ ἡ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ ἐπιστήμη βασιλικὴ τυγχάνει κατὰ τὴν διοίκησιν πρόνοια· ἐπεὶ τὰ παρὰ τῶν στρατηγῶν ἢ ῥητόρων γινόμενα ἄλλου ἕνεκεν γίγνεται. οἷον ὁ στρατηγὸς ἕνεκα τοῦ περιγενέσθαι τῶν πολεμίων στρατηγεῖ, καὶ ὁ ῥήτωρ δὲ τοῦ τιμωρήσασθαι χάριν δικάζεται ἢ συμβουλεύει τιμῆς ἢ βοηθείας ἕνεκα ἤ τινος ἄλλου τοιούτου. καὶ τούτων ἁπάντων τὸ τέλος ἑτέρου ἕνεκα γίνεται, καί εἰσιν αἱ πράξεις τῶν πρός τι. ὅ τε γὰρ χαλινοποιὸς τὸν χαλινὸν ἑτέρου ἕνεκα ποιεῖ καὶ ὁ τέκτων τὸ βάθρον καὶ ὁ οἰκοδόμος τὴν οἰκίαν καὶ ὁ σκυτοτόμος τόδε τι. ὁ μέντοι πολιτικὸς οὐκ ἐν ἄλλωι τὸ τέλος ἔχει· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῶι τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν συνείληφεν. ἀλλὰ πάντα καὶ τὰ παρ' ἄλλων γιγνόμενα ἐφέσει τῆς εὐδαιμονίας γίγνεται.

7 ὅτι τὰ μὲν παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων οἷον στρατηγῶν ἢ ῥητόρων γινόμενα ἄλλου ἕνεκεν γίνονται καί εἰσιν αἱ πράξεις τῶν πρός τι. ὁ μέντοι πολιτικὸς οὐκέτι ἐν ἄλλωι τὸ τέλος ἔχει· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῶι τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν συνείληφε *i. m.* **p**
15 ὁσαχῶς ἀποδείκνυται μὴ εἶναι πολιτικοὺς τοὺς ῥήτορας *i. m.* **p**

1 ῥήτορι **O** : τῶ ῥήτορι **p**
2 ἢ *i. ras. vid.* **R**
3 ἄλλοις **O** : ἀλόγοις **v**
4 τῶν καλῶν *sc.* ὧν οἱ ἄλλοι δέονται, *cf. vers.* 14
αὐτός τι **O** : αὐτότι **P**
7 γινόμενα **O** : γιγνόμενα **R**
ἕνεκεν **O** : ἕνεκα **B**
γίγνεται **A P R V b m v** : γίνεται **B K p**
8 ἕνεκα **O** : ἕνεκεν **V**
9 συμβουλεύει/ **K**
τιμῆς **O** : καὶ τιμῆς **p v**
10 ἕνεκα **O** : ἕνεκεν **p**
11 γίνεται **A B V p v** : γίγνεται **K P R b m**
σιν
εἰ////// : σιν *a manu ceteris manibus recentiore* **K**
12-13 οἰκοδόμενος τὴν οἰκ/ίαν **A**
13 ὁ σκυτοτόμος: τοτόμος *legi non potest in fine pag.* **R**, *suppl. i. m. pag. sequentis m. rec.* **R**
μέντι **b**
οὐκ **O** : οὐκέτι **A R p v** (*ex vers. 4?*)
ἄλλω: λ *prius ex corr.* **V**
15 ἀλλὰ **B K P V b m** : τὰ δὲ ἄλλα **A R p v**
γιγνόμενα **K P R b m** *et* **V** *sed in hoc* γ *alterum ex corr.* : γινόμενα **A B p v**
γίγνεται **K P R b m** : γίνεται **A B V p v**

5 καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἀπόχρη περὶ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ. ἃ δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ῥήτορας
λέγουσιν ἀποδεικνύντες αὐτοὺς οὐκ εἶναι πολιτικούς, τάδε τυγχάνει. ἀκρι-
βῶς γάρ σοι τὸν πολιτικὸν παραστῆσαι βουλόμενος καὶ τάδε προστίθημι,
746 D. ἵνα πανταχόθεν θεωρῇς ἐν τοῖς ἐδαφίοις τὸν ῥήτορα εἰδότα / μὲν τὸν πολι-
τικὸν ἀκριβῶς, ἐπίτηδες δὲ τὸν λόγον πρὸς τὸ πιθανὸν τῆι τέχνηι μετά-
6 γοντα. οὐδὲ γάρ, ὥς φασιν οἱ ἀντειπόντες τῶι λόγωι φιλόσοφοι, καὶ τὰ
παρὰ Πλάτωνος Ἀριστείδης ἠγνόει καὶ τὸν πολιτικὸν οὐκ ἠπίστατο,
ἀλλ', εἰ ἐντυγχάνοις τῶι λόγωι, τὰς προσηγορίας, εἴπερ τις ἄλλος, ἀκριβῶς
7 εὑρίσκεται ταύτας καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπιστάμενος ὁ σοφιστής. τί οὖν, φασιν,
ὁ πολιτικὸς πάντων ἐπιστήμων ἐστὶ καὶ ἐπιτακτικός, οἱ μέντοι ῥήτορες
οὐκ ἐπέταττον, ἀλλ' ἐπετάττοντο παρὰ τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῶν νόμων καὶ
διακόνων ἀπεπλήρουν τάξιν τὸ κελευόμενον ποιοῦντες; ἔτι ὁ πολιτικὸς
πάσας ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῶι τὰς ἀρετὰς εὐεργετικός ἐστι καὶ σπουδαίων ἠθῶν
κατασκευαστικός, οἱ δὲ ῥήτορες καλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς Ἀθηναίους οὐκ
8 ἐποίησαν. οὐκ ἄρα ἦσαν πολιτικοί. καὶ εἰ μὲν δικαίως ὁ δῆμος καὶ καλῶς

σ
3 προτίθημι **A**
4 θεωρῇς : η *i. ras.* **A** : *ex corr.* **V**
ἐν τοῖς ἐδαφίοις: *cf. ad p. 155, 13*
τὸν (*ante* πολιτικὸν) *rad. corr. ex* τῶν **K** : τῶν **P**
5 τὸ πιθανὸν **A R p v** : πιθανὸν **B K P V b m** *cf. 127, 3*
7 παρὰ **R V** : π/// **B b v** : περὶ **K P m p** *et* **A** *sed in hoc* ερὶ *i. ras.*
8 εἰ ἐντυγχάνοις **B P R m p** *et* **K** *sed in hoc* οι *i. ras. m. rec.* : εἰ ἐντυγχάνῃς **V**:
τες
εἰ ἐντυγχάνεις : ει *i. ras.* **b** : οἱ ἐντυγχάνον: οἱ *et* ν *in fine i. ras.*, ν *corr. ex* ι *vid.* **A** : εἰ ἐντεύξῃ **v**
ἐντυγχάνοις τῶι λόγωι : *si disputatio mea* (*ad* λόγωι *cf. p. 131, 2*) *in manus tuas venerit, ex ea videbis praeter ceteros hunc ipsum sophistam* (*Aristidem*) *inveniri optimam horum nominum appellativorum* (πολιτικοί, ῥήτορες) *scientiam habentem*
τὰς προσηγορίας **A R p v** : τῆς προσηγορίας **B K P V b m**
9 εὑρίσκεται **O** : εὑρίσκετε: ε *i. ras.* **A**
ταύτας **O** : ταῦτα **B**
9-10 ἄλλος καὶ αὐτὸς εὑρίσκεται ἀκριβῶς ταῦτα ἐπιστάμενος **B**
10 ἐστὶ *i. ras.* **K**
11 τῶν νόμων **O** : ν *prius in* νόμων *i. ras.* **K** : τοῦ νόμου **V**
12 ἀπεπλήρουν **O** : ου *ex* ω *corr. vid.* **V** : ἐπλήρουν **p** : ἀνεπλήρουν *Paris. 2952*
τάξιν **O** : τὴν τάξιν **A**
ante ποιοῦντες *add.* ἐπλήρουν **V**
ἔτι: ἔ *i. ras.* **K**[1]
13 ἠθῶν **O** : ἐθῶν **B**
14 καὶ ἀγαθοὺς **O** : κἀγαθοὺς **B**
ἀθηναίους οὐκ ἐποίησαν **B K P R V b m**: οὐκ ἐποίησαν ἀθηναίους **A p v**
15 καὶ καλῶς **A K R b m p v** : καλῶς **B P V**

εἰς αὐτοὺς <οὐκ> ἐξήμαρτεν, οὐκ ἦσαν ἄνδρες πολιτικοί· εἰ δὲ ἀδίκως
καὶ ἀναξίως αὐτῶν ὁ δῆμος κατέγνωκεν, οὐκ ἐγένετο παρ' αὐτῶν τὸ
πλῆθος καλὸν κἀγαθόν· τῶν γὰρ πολιτικῶν ἴδιόν ἐστι τὸ τοὺς ὑπηκόους
9 ποιεῖν καλοὺς κἀγαθούς. ἔτι εἰ δημοκρατία ἦν καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν ταύτην
οἱ ἄνδρες ἠσπάζοντο, οὐκ ἦσαν πολιτικοί. εἴπομεν γὰρ ἅπαξ, ὅτι ὁ
πολιτικὸς ἄλληι πολιτείαι οὐχ ὑπόκειται, ἀρίστης πολιτείας εἰκὼν αὐτὸς
10 τυγχάνων τῶι βίωι· βασιλεῖ γάρ ἐστι τὰ πάντα παραπλήσιος. πάλιν
εἰ οἱ ἄνδρες νόμοις ἐπείθοντο καὶ οὐκ ἦσαν ἀντὶ νόμων τῆι πόλει, μᾶλλον
δὲ εἰ αὐτοὶ νόμοι οὐκ ἦσαν βίωι καὶ προαιρέσει καὶ πράξεσιν καὶ τῶι
ἐπιτακτικοὶ εἶναι, οὐκ ἦσαν πολιτικοί. δεῖ γὰρ τὸν πολιτικὸν ἁπασῶν
ὄντα τῶν ἀρετῶν περιεκτικὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἑαυτῶι τυγχάνειν ἀστασίαστον
καὶ ἀτάραχον τὸ κῦρος ἔχοντα τῆς πολιτείας. ὅθεν τὸν δίκαιον Ἀριστείδην
πολιτικὸν μέν φασι γεγενῆσθαι, οὐ μέντοι γε χρήσασθαι τῆι πολιτικῆι.
11 ταῦτά σοι περί τε τοῦ πολιτικοῦ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν προλαβεῖν
ἀκόλουθον ἦν. γνώσηι γὰρ ἐντεῦθεν τὸν Ἀριστείδην ἐκ τῶν κατὰ μέ-

1 αὐτου (*sic*) **B** : αὐτὰ **P**
<οὐκ> *Lenz*
εἰ **O** : οἱ **P**
ἀδίκως: ι *i. ras.* **K**
2 αὐτῶν ὁ δῆμος **O** : ὁ δῆμος αὐτῶν **A v**
ἐγένετο **O** : ἐγένοντο **A v**
4 κἀγαθούς **A B R V p v** : καὶ ἀγαθοὺς **K P b m**
εἰ *i. ras.* **R** : ἢ **B**
4-5 ταύτην οἱ ἄνδρες **O** : οἱ ἄνδρες ταύτην **R**
5 οἱ ἄνδρες *hic om. et pos. ante* πολιτικοὶ **A p v**, *cf. vers.* 1
ἅπαξ **O** : ἅπαντες **P**
6 εἰκὼν αὐτὸς **O** : αὐτὸς εἰκὼν **B** : εἰκὼν *pos. post* 7 βίω *Vat. 1336*
7 πάλιν *i. ras. ampliore* **p**
8 εἰ *i. ras.* **A**
οἱ *sup. lin.* **P**
9 εἰ **O** : οἱ **b**
προαιρέσει **O** : προαιρέσεσι **B**
πράξεσιν **A** : πράξεσι **O**
καί: κ *i. ras.* **m**[1]
τῷ **O** : τὸ **K**
10 ἁπασῶν: ν *i. ras. m. rec.* **K**
11 τῶν//ἀρετῶν **R**
13 μέν *om.* **A**
φασι γεγενῆσθαι **B K P b m** : γεγενῆσθαί φασιν **A R p v** : φασι γενέσθαι **V**
14 περί τε **O** : παρά τε **P**
περὶ *alterum om.* **v**
15 ἀκόλουθον: *'et* ον *i. ras. m. rec.* **K**
γνώσῃ: η *i. ras.* **P**

ρος ἐγκωμίων δεινῶς βιαζόμενον παραστῆσαι τοὺς ἄνδρας πολιτικούς.
747 D. **12** ἵνα δὲ λοιπὸν / ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος γένηται πρὸς τὸ τὴν ἐξήγησιν εὑρεῖν ἑτοίμως, Πλάτωνος πρῶτον ἐφοδεύσω τὸν διάλογον. Σωκράτης περὶ ῥητορικῆς Γοργίαι διαλεγόμενος καὶ ὅρους ἀπαιτήσας τῆς τέχνης, εἶτα τοὺς διδομένους διασύρων, εἰς τοῦτο τὸν λόγον συνήγαγεν, ὡς ἀποφήνασθαι
13 περὶ ῥητορικῆς τάδε· <<δοκεῖ τοίνυν, ὦ Γοργία, εἶναί τι ἐπιτήδευμα τεχνικὸν μὲν οὔ, ψυχῆς δὲ στοχαστικῆς καὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ φύσει δεινῆς προσομιλεῖν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. καλῶ δὲ αὖ ἐγὼ τοῦτο τὸ κεφάλαιον κολακείαν. ταύτης μοι δοκεῖ τῆς ἐπιτηδεύσεως πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα μόρια εἶναι, ἓν δὲ καὶ ἡ ὀψοποιική· ὃ δοκεῖ μὲν εἶναι τέχνη, ὡς δ' ὁ ἐμὸς λόγος, οὐκ ἔστι τέχνη, ἀλλ' ἐμπειρία καὶ τριβή. ταύτης μόριον καὶ τὴν ῥητορικὴν ἐγὼ καλῶ καὶ τὴν κομμωτικὴν καὶ τὴν σοφιστικήν, τέτταρα ταῦτα μόρια ἐπὶ τέτταρσι πράγμασι.>> τί οὖν ἐστι ῥητορική; <<πολιτικῆς μορίου εἴδωλον>>. καὶ πρῶτον οὕτως ὁρισάμενος, τί ἐστι

3 ἔφοδος τοῦ ὅλου διαλόγου Πλάτωνος ἤγουν αὐτοῦ Γοργίου *i. m.* **p**
8 ὅπως ἠναγκάσθη Πλάτων ὁρίσασθαι τὴν ῥητορικὴν ἀπὸ διαιρέσεως ἀρξάμενος τῆς πρώτης καὶ ἀμέσου *i. m.* **p**
13 ὅρος ῥητορικῆς *i. m.* **V**

1 δεινῶς **O** : δεινῶν **B** : δεινὰ **P**
2 ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος **B K P R V b m** : ὁ λόγος ἡμῖν **A p v**
εὑρεῖν **O** : ἐφευρεῖν **B**
ως
3 ἑτοίμος **p**
πρῶτον **A p v** : πρότερον **B K P R V b m** *aeque apte, cf. B 115, 5 et p. 50*
5 τοῦτο τὸν **K b p v** : τοῦτοτόν: τ *ultim. ex* ν *corr. vid.* **m** : τοῦτον τὸν **A B P R V**
6 τῶδε **V**
δοκεῖ: *Plat. Gorg. 463 a*
δοκεῖ τοίνυν **B K P V b m** : δοκεῖ τοίνυν μοι *ex Platone* **A R p v** *et Aristid.* Ὑπ. ῥητ. *II 6, 10 D.*
τι *om.* **B**
8 δὲ (δ' **A v**) αὖ ἐγὼ τοῦτο τὸ **A K P R V p v** : δὲ ἐγὼ αὖ τοῦτο τὸ **B** : δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐγὼ τὸ **b m** *et Platonis* **B P T** *et Aristid.*: δὲ ἐγὼ αὐτοῦ τὸ *Platonis* **F**
10 ἡ **O** *Plat.* : *om. Aristid.*
ὀψοποιική **O** : ὀψοποιητική **B V** *Plat.*
ὁ ἐμὸς **O** : οὑμὸς **V**
12 καὶ τὴν κομμωτικὴν **B K P R V b m** *Plat.* : καὶ τήν γε κομμωτικὴν **A p v**
12-13 τέτταρα **O** *Plat.* : τέσσαρα **p**
τα
13 ταῦ// **p**
τέτταρσι **A B K R m p v** : τέταρσι **P V** : τέτταρσιν *Plat.* : τέσσαρσι **b**
14 πολιτικῆς **O** *Plat. Gorg. 462 d 2* : πολιτικοῦ **A v**
οὕτως **O** : οὗτος **A v**
ἐστι **O** : ἐστιν ἡ **B**

ῥητορική, ἐπάγει καί, ὁποία τίς ἐστιν, οὕτως· <<καλὸν ἢ αἰσχρόν; — **14** αἰσχρὸν ἔγωγε. — τὰ γὰρ κακὰ αἰσχρὰ καλῶ.>> εἶθ' ἑξῆς Γοργίου τὴν ἀσάφειαν αἰτιασαμένου τοῦ λόγου ἄνωθεν Σωκράτης ἀναλαμβάνων τὸν λόγον καὶ τὸν πολιτικὸν ὁριζόμενος διαιρεῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον εἰς δύο, σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ τῆι ψυχῆι περιτίθησι νομοθετικὴν καὶ δικαστικήν, τῶι δὲ σώματι ἰατρικὴν καὶ γυμναστικήν. <<τεττάρων δὴ τούτων καὶ πρὸς τὸ βέλτιστον θεραπευόντων τῶν μὲν τὴν ψυχήν, τῶν δὲ τὸ σῶμα>> — ἥ τε γὰρ νομοθετικὴ τοῖς δόγμασιν ἀποσκευάζει τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἡμᾶς, ἥ τε δικαστικὴ τῆι τιμωρίαι διορθοῦται τὰ πταίσματα· καὶ ἡ μὲν ἰατρικὴ τῶι σώματι τὴν ὑγίειαν περιποιεῖ, ἡ δὲ γυμναστικὴ τὴν παρὰ τῆς ἰατρικῆς ὑγίειαν διατηρεῖ — καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων οὕτως παρασκευαζόντων τὸ βέλτιστον ψυχῆι τε καὶ σώματι ἡ κολακικὴ τέσσαρα ταῦτα τοῦ πολιτικοῦ ἔργα ὑπερχομένη, τέτραχα ἑαυτὴν διανείμασα, ἓν ἕκαστον ὑπέδυ τούτων
748 D. καὶ τῶι ἀεὶ ἡδίστωι θηρεύουσα τῶν παρόντων τὴν ἄνοιαν ἐξα/πατᾶι τε καὶ

1 οὕτως **O** : οὕτω **v**
1-2 αἰσχρὸν αἰσχρὸν ἔγωγε *Vat. 1336* : αἰσχρὸν ἔγωγε **O** : καλὸν ἢ αἰσχρὸν λέγεις αὐτὴν εἶναι; — αἰσχρὸν ἔγωγε *Plat. Gorg. 463 d 3-4*
2 τὰ γὰρ **O** *Plat.* : τὰ μὲν γὰρ **P**
3 ἀναλαμβάνων **O** : ἀναβαίνων **V**
4 ὁριζόμενος **O** : διοριζόμενος **A v**
ἐ/ς **R**
5 περιτίθησι **A R V p v** : παρατί(ή **P**)θησι **B K P b m**, *vix deterius*
δικαστικὴν **O** *et Platonis* **F** *464 b 8*, δικαιοσύνην *Platonis* **B P T** *Aristid. Olympiod.*
6 τεττάρων : *Plat. Gorg. 464 c 3*
δὴ **O** *Plat.* : δὲ *Aristid. Olympiod.*
post τούτων *add.* ὄντων **K b m** : οὐσῶν *hab. Plat.*
καὶ **O** : καὶ ἀεὶ *Plat.*
7 θεραπευόντων **O** : θεραπευουσῶν *Plat.*
τῶν μὲν τὴν ψυχὴν τῶν δὲ τὸ σῶμα **O** : τῶν μὲν τὸ σῶμα, τῶν δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν *Plat.*
10 ὑγίειαν **B m** : ὑγείαν **O**
11 ὑγίειαν **B K R V m** : ὑγείαν **A b p v** : ὑγίαν **P**
τεσσάρων **O** : τεττάρων **P**
οὕτως **A B K P R p** : οὕτω **V b m v**
12 ψυχῆ **O** : τῆ ψυχῆ **p**
τε καὶ **O** : καὶ **A**
post τε *perrexit* τέτραχα - τούτων, *tum haec verba eras. et post ras. perg.* καὶ σώματι **p**
κολακικὴ **O** : κολαστικὴ **V** : κολακευτικὴ *Plat. Gorg. 464 c 5*
13 ὑπερχομένη **O** : παρεχομένη **V**
τέτραχα **O** : τέτραχῆ **v**
14 ἥδιστα **P**
θηρεύουσα *Lenz* : θεραπεύουσα **K b m** : θηρεύεται **R v p** *Plat.* : θηρεύετ^α

ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ σώματος ὑποδύεται, τουτέστιν ὑπεισέρχεται, ὑποκρίνεται, ὡς ἐκείνηι δοκεῖν εἶναι ταυτόν, τὴν μὲν ἰατρικὴν ἡ ὀψοποιικὴ — ἐκείνης γὰρ τὴν ὄντως ὑγίειαν περιποιούσης ἡμῖν ὀψοποιικὴ ὄψοις καὶ ζωμοῖς ἡδέσι καὶ ἡδονῆι τὸ σῶμα τῶι δοκεῖν ἀναρρώννυσιν — τὴν δὲ γυμναστικὴν

15 ὑποδύεται ἡ κομμωτική. ἡ μὲν γὰρ τὴν ἀληθῆ εὐεξίαν περιποιεῖ καὶ εὐανθῆ τὰ σώματα τῆι γυμνασίαι παρίστησιν, ἡ δὲ ἀλοιφαῖς καὶ χρίσμασιν δοκεῖ καλλωπίζειν τὰ σώματα. πάλιν ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν νομοθετικὴν ὑποδύεται ἡ σοφιστική. ἡ μὲν γὰρ τὴν ἀρετὴν ὄντως τοῖς ὑπηκόοις διὰ τῶν δογμάτων περιποιεῖ, ἡ σοφιστικὴ δὲ ἀρετῆς φάσκουσα εἶναι διδάσκαλος οὐδὲν ἀληθὲς τοιοῦτο τοῖς συνοῦσι περιποιεῖ. καὶ πάλιν ὑπεισέρχεται

(*de prima littera non constat, cum fol. integrum non sit,* α *sscta. ex parte extat, de* ι *littera post* α *scripta nihil constat*; *dubito num* τ *in fine ex* ι *correct. sit* **A** : θηρεύει *praefixo* γρ. *ssc.* **p** *et Aristid. II 8, 5 Dind.*: θεραπεύεται **B P V**
τῶν παρόντων **O**, *non hab. Plat.* : καὶ τῶν παρόντων *Vat. 1336 et Dind.*
post ἄνοιαν *add.* καὶ **A R p v**
ἐξαπατᾶ τὲ **v** *et* **p** *in quo* τὲ *ex* ται *corr. vid.* : ἐξαπᾶται **A B P R V** : ἐξαπατᾶ **K b m** (*Plat. qui pergit* ὥστε δοκεῖ πλείστου ἀξία εἶναι)

1 τουτέστιν ὑπεισέρχεται ὑποκρίνεται **B K P R V b m**: *om.* **A p v**; *possis suspicari haec verba postea explicandi causa addita esse, nisi forte auctor ipse scholiorum a se conscriptorum sermone hic usus est*
2 ἐκείνῃ *scrips. Vat. 1336* : ἐκείνη **O**
δοκεῖν **O** : δοκεῖ **A** *Plat. sed Sopater duas constructiones inter se miscuisse vid.*
τὴν μὲν ἰατρικὴν **K b m p** *et m. rec.* **R** : τῇ μὲν ἰατρικῇ **A B P R V v**; *cf. Jebb ad Soph. Phil. 1111 sq., accusativus propter 4 sq. necessarius est*
ὀψοποιικὴ **O** : ὀψοποιητικὴ **B V**
2-4 ἡ ὀψοποιικὴ - γυμναστικὴν *om.* **K**, *add. i. m. m. rec.* **K**
3 ὑγίειαν **O** : ὑγείαν **V**
ἡ *ante* ὀψοποιικὴ *non hab.* **A K P R V** : ἡ *hab.* **B b m p v** *et sup. lin. m. rec.* **R** *et i. m. m. rec.* **K**, *cf. ad p. 134, 3*
ὀψοποιῇ *ut vid.* **V**
ζωμοῖς: ι *i. ras.*, ο *arras. vid.* **P**
4 τῶι δοκεῖν **A B K R b m p v** : τὸ δοκεῖν **P V**, *cf. p. 134, 2*
ἀναρρώννυσιν **A p** : -σι **O**
5 ἀληθῆ : η *alterum ex corr.* **V**
6 ἀλοιφαῖς : οιφαῖς *i. ras.* **p**
χρίσμασιν *Vat. 1336* : χρήσμασιν **A** : χρίσμασι **O**
9 φάσκουσα **A B K V b m v** : φάσκουσ: α *ssc. fort. i. ras.* **p** : φάσκουσα *vel* φάσκουσα **R**, *corr. in* φάσκουσιν *m. rec.* **R** : φάσκουσιν **P**
10 ἀληθὲς **B K P R V b m** : ἀληθῶς **A p v**
τοιοῦτο **O** : τοιοῦτον **v**
ὑπεισέρχεται **O** : ὑπέρχεται **A v** *sed cf. vers. 1*

τὴν δικαστικὴν ἡ ῥητορική· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ὄντως τοῦ δικαίου ποιεῖται τὴν πρόνοιαν, ἡ δὲ τῶι δοκεῖν.

16 οὕτως ἀποδεδειγμένης τέταρτον μέρος κολακείας ῥητορικῆς ἐπήνεγκε Πῶλος· καὶ οἱ ῥήτορες ἄρα κόλακες ἦσαν; ὅθεν Σωκράτης καὶ τοῦτο δεῖξαι βουλόμενος ζητεῖ πόρρωθεν, ποῖος βίος ἐστὶ πρὸς ἡδονὴν καὶ ποῖος πρὸς τὸ βέλτιστον· οἷον ὅτι πρὸς ἡδονήν ἐστι κιθαρωιδική, αὐλητρική, ποιητική,
17 διθύραμβος. εἶτα περὶ ῥητορικῆς ἐρωτῶν φησιν ὁ Σωκράτης, ὅτι, ἐὰν περιέληι τις τῆς ποιήσεως τὰ μέτρα, δημηγορία ἐστὶ τὸ λειπόμενον. καὶ τοῦτο λαβὼν ὁμολογούμενον δείκνυσιν, ὅτι καὶ ἡ ῥητορικὴ πρὸς
18 ἡδονὴν ὁρᾶι ὥσπερ ἡ ποιητική. εἶτα σαφέστερον ἑξῆς ἠρώτησεν ὁ Σωκράτης, πότερον οἱ δημηγοροῦντες Ἀθήνησι τοῦ βελτίστου ἀντιποιούμενοι τοῦτο ποιοῦσι ζητοῦντες, ὅπως βέλτιστοι ἔσονται οἱ πολῖται, ἢ καὶ αὐτοὶ πρὸς ἡδονὴν ἀφορῶσιν· ἐνέστη φάσκων· «τί δέ; Θεμιστοκλέα οὐκ ἀκούεις καὶ Κίμωνα καὶ Μιλτιάδην καὶ Περικλέα;» ὁ Σωκράτης

4 ὅθεν ἀποδείκνυσι Πλάτων, ὅτι καὶ ἡ ῥητορικὴ πρὸς τὴν κολακείαν ὁρᾶι *i. m.* **p**
1 τὴν **O** : *om.* **v** : *ante* τοῦ δικαίου *pos.* **B**
3 οὕτως **B R V p v** : οὕτω **A** *et* **P** *qui post* δοκεῖν *non distinxit* : οὕτως οὖν **K b m**
ἀποδεδειγμένης **O** : ἀποδεδειγμένη **V**
ῥητορικῆς **A B P R V v** : τῆς ῥητορικῆς **K b m p** *sed in hoc* τῆς *sup. lin. add., cf. ad p. 133, 3*
ἐπήνεγκε: εγ *i. ras. vid.* **K**
4 πῶλος **O** : τῶ λόγω **p**; *Plat. Gorg. 466 a 10*
6 ποιητικὴ *om.* **b**
7 περὶ ῥητορικῆς *i. ras. m. rec. corr.* **K**
φησιν **O** : φέρε *ut vid.* **p**
ὅτι^ **B**
7-8 εἴ τις περιέλοι *Plat. Gorg. 502 c 5 cod.* **F**, περιέλοιτο **B P T**
8 ποιήσεως **O** *Plat. l.c.* : ποιητικῆς *Dindorfii* **L** : *om. sed hab.* τῆς **V**
10 ἑξῆς **O** : εὐθὺς *Vat. 1336*; *Gorg. 502 e*
ἠρώτησε^(ν ὁ)σωκράτης **B**
11-12 ἀθήνησι - ζητοῦντες *om.* **p**
12 βέλτιστοι **B P R V** : ὡς βέλτιστοι **K b m** *Plat.* : ὅτι βέλτιστοι **A p v**; *suspicor in codd.* **K b m** *et* **A p v** *sermonem communem et vulgarem effectum esse (cf. Plat. Prot. 325 d), praesertim cum Sopat. Platonem non ad verbum afferat*
ὅπως οἱ πολῖται ὡς βέλτιστοι ἔσονται *Plat.*
ἔσονται **O** : ἔσο/νται **A** : ἔσωνται **R**
ἢ *ex. corr.* **V**
13 ἐνέστη **O** : ἐν αἷς τι **K**; *transitio a Socrate ad Calliclem solito durior*
φάσκων : *ssc.* ὁ καλλικλῆς **m** : *post* φάσκων *add.* **b**; *Gorg. 503 c 1*
τί δὲ **B K P V m p** : τί δε (αἱ) **b** : τί δαὶ **A R v**
14 ὁ **O** : *eras.* **m** : *om.* **b**
post ὁ *ssc.* δὲ *m. rec.* **R**

καταναγκάζων αὐτὸν ὁμολογῆσαι, ὅτι οὐκ ἦσαν πολιτικοί, ἀλλὰ κόλακες, πόρρωθεν πάλιν, ὅπερ αὐτῶι σύνηθες, τῶν προκειμένων ἁπτόμενος,
149 D. διαλαμβάνει περὶ τάξεως καὶ ἀτα/ξίας παραδειγματικῶς ἐρωτῶν, τίνι βελτίων γίγνεται οἰκία, τάξει ἢ ἀταξίαι. τί δὲ ναυπηγός; πῶς διατίθησι τὸ πλοῖον; τί δὲ ζωγράφος ἢ οἰκοδόμος ἢ ἄλλοι πάντες δημιουργοί;
19 ὁμολογηθέντος τούτου, ὅτι ἡ τάξις ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον ἄγει, ἐζήτησε, τίς ἡ τοῦ σώματος τάξις, ἧι βέλτιστον τὸ σῶμα γίγνεται. λέγει ὁ Καλλικλῆς· ὑγίεια. τίς δὲ ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς τάξις, ἧι βελτίων γίγνεται; ἠπόρησε Καλλικλῆς. ἀπεκρίνατο Σωκράτης, ὅτι ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ σωφροσύνη. συμφήσαντος Καλλικλέους ὁ Σωκράτης ἐπήνεγκεν· <<οὐκοῦν πρὸς ταῦτα ἀποβλέπων ὁ ῥήτωρ, ὁ τεχνικὸς καὶ ἀγαθός, καὶ τοὺς λόγους προσοίσει ταῖς ψυχαῖς, ἂν λέγηι, καὶ τὰς πράξεις ἁπάσας, καὶ δῶρον ἐάν τι διδῶι, <δώσει>, καὶ ἐάν τι ἀφαιρῆται, ἀφαιρήσεται, πρὸς τοῦτο ἀεὶ τὸν νοῦν

3 διαλαμβάνει **O** : περιλαμβάνει **V**
ἐρωτῶν: *Plat. Gorg. 503 e sqq.*
4 γίγνεται **P R V m** : γίνεται: ι *i. ras.* **b** : γίνεται **A B K P V**
τί δαὶ **A**
5 πλεῖον **V**
τί δαὶ **A**
6 ὁμολογηθήτο τούτου **P**
ἐζήτησε *om.* **B**
7 τάξις *om.* (*in fine versus*) **B**
γίνεται τὸ σῶμα *Vat. 1336*
γίγνεται **K P R b m** : γίνεται **A B V p v**
λέγει: *504 b*
8 τίς δὲ **O** : τί δὲ **V** *falso imitatus Plat. Gorg. 540 c 1*
γίγνεται **K P R V b m** : γίνεται **A B p v**
ἠπόρησε : σε *i. ras. m. rec.* **K** καλλι
ἠπόρησεν ὁ καλλικλῆς **A** : ἠπόρησεν ὁ περικλῆς **p**
9 ὁ σωκράτης *Vat. 1336*
10 οὐκοῦν *Plat. Gorg. 504 d 5*
11 ἀποβλέπων **O** : βλέπων *Plat.*
ὁ ῥήτωρ **O** : ὁ ῥήτωρ ἐκεῖνος *Plat.*
καὶ **O** : τε καὶ *Plat.*
12 ἂν **O** : οὓς ἂν *Plat.*; *aut* <οὓς> *inserendum est ante* ἂν *aut existimandum Sopatrum consulto* οὓς ἂν *in* ἂν (= ἐὰν) *mutavisse*
τι **A K P R V b m** : τε **B p v**
12-13 διδῶι, <δώσει> *ex Plat. corrigendum est*; διδῶ **B p v** : δίδωσι **K P R V b m** : δίδωσιν **A**
13 καὶ *om. et pro* τι *hab.* τε **B p v**
ἀφαιρῆται **A B K R m p v** : ἀφαιρεῖται **P V b**
ἀφαιρήσεται **O** : ἀφαιρεθήσεται **V**

ἔχων, ὅπως ἂν αὐτοῦ τοῖς πολίταις δικαιοσύνη μὲν ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς γίγνηται, ἀδικία δὲ ἀπαλλάττηται, καὶ ἄλλη δὲ ἀρετὴ ἐγγίγνηται, κακία δὲ ἀπ<ί>ηι». συγχωρήσαντος Καλλικλέους ἐρωτᾶι περὶ Περικλέους, πρῶτον εἰ πεποίηκεν βελτίους Ἀθηναίους ἀργοὺς ποιήσας καὶ φιλαργύρους καὶ εἰς μισθοφορὰν καταστήσας. καὶ ὁμοίως περὶ Κίμωνός φησιν· ἐφυγάδευσαν αὐτόν, φησιν, ἐτῶν δέκα ἵνα αὐτοῦ τῆς φωνῆς μὴ ἀκούσειαν, καὶ περὶ Θεμιστοκλέους ταυτά. Μιλτιάδην δὲ τὸν ἐν Μαραθῶνι εἰς τὸ βάραθρον ἐμβαλεῖν ἐψηφίσαντο, καὶ εἰ μὴ διὰ τὸν πρύτανιν, ἐνέπεσεν ἄν. καίτοι, εἰ ἦσαν ἄνδρες, ὡς σὺ φῄς, ἀγαθοί, οὐκ ἄν ποτε ταῦτα ἔπασχον.

1 αὐτοῦ **B K P R V b m v** *et* **A** *sed in hoc* ʼ *i. ras. vid. et Platonis* **F P T** : αὐτοῦ *Platonis* **B** : αὐτοῖς **p** *et m. rec.* **R**
μὲν **O** *Plat.* : *om.* **V**
ταῖς ψυχαῖς **B K P R V b m** *Plat.* : τῇ ψυχῇ **A p v**
γίγνηται **K P R V b m v** *Plat.* : γίγνεται **A** : γένηται **B** : δείκνυται: *ssc.* ἐνδύηται **p**
2 ἀδικία - ἐγγίγνηται *om.* **A v**
καὶ ἄλλη δὲ ἀρετὴ **O** : καὶ ἡ ἄλλη ἀρετὴ *Plat. sed inter* ἀπαλλάττηται *et* καὶ ἡ ἄλλη *haec hab.* : καὶ σωφροσύνη μὲν ἐγγίγνηται, ἀκολασία δὲ ἀπαλλάττηται *Plat.* : καὶ ἄλλως δὲ ἀρε *et i. m. add.* μὲν τῇ **p**
ἐγγίγνηται **O** : ἐγγίνηται **B**
3 ἀπ<ί>ηι *ex Plat. corrigendum videtur* : ἀπῇ **O** *sed* ῇ *i. ras. vid.* **A**
ἐρωτᾶ περικλῆς (*lin. indux.*) σωκράτης **p**
ἐρωτᾶ περὶ περικλέους *om.* **V**
πρῶτον *om.* **P**
3-4 πρῶτον ἐπεποίηκε **V**
4 πεποίηκεν **A** : πεποίηκε **O**
ἀθηναίους : *ssc.* περικλῆς **p**
5 φῆ' **B**
φησὶν ὡς **p v** *et m. rec.* **R** : φησὶ ὡς **A**
5-6 ἐφυγάδευσαν **O** : ἐξωστράκισαν *Plat. Gorg.* *516 d 6*
6 φησιν **P R V** : φησι **B** : *om.* **A K b m p v** : φησι *pos. post* 6 ἐτῶν *Vat. 1336, fort. omittendum est*
ἐτῶν δέκα **O** : ἐτῶν δέκα : *ssc.* ἔτη *Vat.* *77* : δέκα ἔτη **B** : δέκα ἐτῶν *sed post* ἵνα αὐτοῦ *Plat.*
comma post δέκα *a Dind. positum sustuli*
αὐτοῦ : α *ex corr. vid.* **V**
7 ταυτὰ **O** : ταῦτά φησι **V**
Μιλτιάδην : *Gorg.* *516 d*
ἐν **O** *et Platonis* **B P T** : *om. Platonis* **F**
8 ἐμβαλεῖν ἐψηφίσαντο **O** *et Plat.* : ἐψηφίσαντο ἐμβαλεῖν **K**
9 καίτοι **O** : καὶ τὸ **V** : καίτοι οὗτοι *Plat.*
ἄνδρες ὡς σὺ φῄς ἀγαθοὶ **O** : ὡς φῄς ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ **B** : ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ ὡς σὺ φῄς *Plat.*
post ἀγαθοὶ *pos. i. ras.*; **A**

21 ὥστε εἰ οὗτοι ῥήτορες ἦσαν, οὐ τῆι ἀληθινῆι ῥητορικῆι ἐχρῶντο — ἀληθινὴν δὲ λέγει τὴν πολιτικήν — οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐξέπεσον. ἀλλὰ μεγάλα ἔργα εἰργάσαντο, φησὶν ὁ Καλλικλῆς. οὐδὲ ἐγώ, φησί, ψέγω τούτους ὡς διακόνους, οἷον ὡς καλῶς ὑπηρετήσαντας τῆι πολιτείαι. τούτωι γὰρ τῶι σημαινομένωι καλεῖ διακόνους τοὺς ῥήτορας, ὡς ἐπὶ λέξεώς ἐστι παρὰ τῶι Πλάτωνι τὸ ῥητόν <<μᾶλλον οἷοί τε ἐκπορίζειν τῆι πόλει ὧν ἐπεθύμει. ἀλλὰ γὰρ μεταβιβάζειν τὰς ἐπιθυμίας>> <<ἐπὶ τοῦτο, ὅθεν /
750 D. ἔμελλον ἀμείνους ἔσεσθαι οἱ πολῖται, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν οὐδὲν τούτων διέφερον ἐκεῖνοι, ὅπερ μόνον ἔργον ἐστὶν ἀγαθοῦ πολίτου. ναῦς δὲ καὶ τείχη καὶ νεώρια καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ τοιαῦτα καὶ ἐγώ σοι ὁμολογῶ δεινοτέρους εἶναι
22 ἐκείνους τούτων ἐκπορίζειν>>. καὶ ἑξῆς πάλιν· <<ἄνευ γὰρ σωφροσύνης

1 ὥ^{σ}τε: τ *corr. ex* σ **A**
οὐ **b** *Vat. 77 et* **m** *qui hab. inter* οὐ *et* τῇ *lacunam nulla ras.*: οὔτε **A B K P R V p v** : οὔτε τῆι ἀληθινῆι ῥητορικῆι ἐχρῶντο — οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐξέπεσον — οὔτε τῆι κολακικῆι *Plat. 517 a, cf. p. 86, 2*
τῇ **O** *Plat. Gorg.* : *om.* **B**
2 ἀληθινὴν **O** : ἀληθινὸν **p**
λέ^{ω}γ *vid.* **v**
post ἐξέπεσον *puncto distinxit Lenz*
3 εἰργάσαντο **A B P R V p v** : εἰργάσατο **K b m**
καλλικλῆς **A B p v** *et* καλλι *i. ras. m. rec.* **R** : περικλῆς **K P V b m**
φησὶ *om.* **v**, *sc.* ὁ Σωκράτης
4 ὥς γε διακόνους εἶναι πόλεως, ἀλλά μοι δοκοῦσι τῶν γε νῦν διακονικώτεροι γεγονέναι *Plat.*
οἷον **O** : οὓς *vid. sed non constat* **R**
ὡς ^{οὐ}καλῶς : οὐ *ssc. m. rec.* **R**
6 τῶ **A K P R V m p** : *om.* **B b v**
μᾶλλον **O** : καὶ μᾶλλον *Plat. 517 b 4 post* δοκοῦσι . . . . γεγονέναι, *sed nisi codd. erraverunt, Sopater totam structuram mutavit ne dicam delevit*
οἷοί τε **O** : οἷοί τε ^{ἦσαν} **p** : νοεροί τε **V**
7 μεταβιβάζειν **O** : τὸ μεταβιβάζειν **V**
ἐπιθυμίας *om.* **B**
post ἐπιθυμίας *sic pergit* : καὶ μὴ ἐπιτρέπειν πείθοντες καὶ βιαζόμενοι ἐπὶ τοῦτο *Plat. 517 b 5 sq.*
8 ἔμελλον ἀμείνους ἔσεσθαι **O** *Plat.* : ἔμελλον ἀμείνους εἶναι ἔσεσθαι *Vat. 1336* : ἀμείνους ἔσεσθαι ἔμελλον **v**
post εἰπεῖν *desin.* **R**, *incip.* **r**
τούτων **B K P V b m v** : τοῦτο **A p r**
διέφερον *Plat.* : διάφορον **O**
9 ἐκεῖνοι **O** : ἐκείνοις **p r**
μόνον ἔργον **K P V b m** *Plat.* : ἔργον μόνον **A p r v** : ἔργον **B**
ἐστὶν ἀγαθοῦ πολίτου **B K P V m** : ἐστὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ πολίτου **b** : ἀγαθοῦ πολίτου **A p r v**
11 ἑξῆς: *Plat. 519 a*

καὶ δικαιοσύνης λιμένων καὶ νεωρίων καὶ τειχῶν καὶ φόρων καὶ τοιούτων φλυαριῶν ἐμπεπλήκασι τὴν πόλιν>>. καὶ ἡ μὲν ἔφοδος πᾶσα τοῦ διαλόγου τοιαύτη.

23 εἰ δὲ δεῖ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἀναλαβόντα συντόμως εἰπεῖν, Σωκράτης τὴν νῦν ῥητορικὴν διέβαλεν οὐκ οὖσαν πολιτικήν, ἀλλὰ κολακικήν. καὶ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ πρὸς Γοργίαν καὶ Πῶλον. τοῦ δὲ Καλλικλέους προσαγαγόντος Θεμιστοκλέα καὶ Περικλέα καὶ Μιλτιάδην καὶ Κίμωνα ὡς ῥήτορας πολιτικοὺς ἀποδείκνυσιν ὁ Σωκράτης οὐχ οὕτως ἔχοντα τὸν λόγον, ἐξ ὧν οὐ βελτίους πεποιήκασιν 'Αθηναίους, τοὐναντίον δὲ φαύλους τῶι πρὸς ἡδονὴν ἀεὶ πολιτεύεσθαι. καὶ ἔστιν ὁ μὲν Γοργίας ἐκ σοφιστικῆς ὡρμημένος· ὅθεν ὁ περὶ τῆς ῥητορικῆς λόγος Σωκράτει πρὸς τοῦτον γεγένηται. Καλλικλῆς δὲ πολιτεύεται. διὸ καὶ περὶ τῶν 'Αθήνησι πολιτευσαμένων γέγονεν πρὸς τοῦτον ἡ ζήτησις.

24 ὁ τοίνυν 'Αριστείδης ταύτην τὴν διασκευὴν τοῦ λόγου δεξάμενος πρὸς

2 τέλος τῆς ἐφόδου τοῦ διαλόγου *i. m.* **p**
14 ὅπως 'Αριστείδης τὴν διασκευὴν τοῦ λόγου δεξάμενος πρὸς ταύτην ἀντέγραψε *i. m.* **p**

2 διαλόγου **O** : λόγου **A**
4 δεῖ **O** : δὴ **V**
ὑπόθεσιν **A B P V p r v** : ὑπόσχεσιν **K b m**
ἀναλαβόντα συντόμως **B K P V b m** : συντόμως ἀναλαβόντα **A p r v**
5 διέβαλεν **O** : διέβαλλεν **A v**
οὐκ οὖσαν **B K P V b m** : ὡς οὐκ οὖσαν **A p r v**, *non male, sed voluit dicere* : *iniuria arti rhetoricae maledixit Socrates contendens eam esse non* πολιτικὴν *sed* κολακικήν; ὡς *igitur non est quod addatur*
6 αὐτοῦ **B K P b m** : αὐτῷ **A p r v** : *om.* **V**; αὐτῷ *in* **A p r v** *propter vers. 11 puto, ubi res est diversa*
6-7 προσαγαγόντος **B K P V b m** : προαγαγόντος **A v** : προσαγορεύοντος **p r** ; *Plat. 503 c*
7 καὶ περικλέα καὶ μιλτιάδην καὶ κίμωνα **O** : καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους **B**
8 ἀποδείκνυσιν ὁ σωκράτης **O** : ἀποδείκνυσι σωκράτης **B**
ἔ/χοντα **A**
9 οὐ **O** : *om. Dind., sed cf. C*[a] *p. 154, 3*
10 ἀεὶ **O** : *om.* **A v**
10-12 καὶ - πολιτεύεται *om.* **V**
11 ὁρμώμενος *corr. in* ὡρμημένος **r**
ὁ λόγος *sed hab. etiam* ὁ *ante* περὶ **A**
πρὸς: ς *i. ras. m. rec.* **K**
13 γέγονεν **B** : γέγονε **O**
ζήτησις : ς *corr. ex* ν **K**
14 λόγου **O** : διαλόγου **p r** *sed cf. quae i. m. adnot.* **p** (*vid. apparat. super.*)

μὲν τὸν περὶ ῥητορικῆς λόγον τοὺς ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς λόγους συνέγραψεν,
πρὸς δὲ τὴν διαβολὴν τῶν ἀνδρῶν τὸν νῦν εἰς ἐξήγησιν ἡμῖν προκείμενον,
ἐμμεθόδως τὰς λύσεις πρὸς τὰς ἀπὸ τῶν συλλογισμῶν καὶ τῶν ὅρων
25 βίας ἀπεργασάμενος. Πλάτωνος μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἀρετῆι τὸν πολιτικὸν ὑπο-
γράψαντος, ὡς προλαβόντες ἐδείξαμεν, εἶτα δεικνύντος πολιτικοὺς οὐκ
ὄντας τοὺς ῥήτορας, Ἀριστείδης, σὺν τέχνηι τὴν ὕλην οἰκονομούμενος,
τὰς πράξεις τὰς μερικὰς ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν τὴν καθόλου μετήνεγκεν, ἀποδιδοὺς
τὸ κατ' ἀρετὴν τοῖς ῥήτορσι τέλειον. καὶ τοὐναντίον πεποίηκε Πλάτωνι.
26 ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν ὅρων ἀρξάμενος μετῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὰ πρόσωπα, εἶτ' ἀπὸ
51 D. τῶν προσώπων ἐπὶ τὰ / πράγματα· ὁ δὲ κάτωθεν, ἀπὸ τῶν πράξεων,
ἀπὸ τῶν ῥητόρων, ἀρξάμενος ἐπὶ τὸν πολιτικὸν ἀνατρέχει, ἔνια μὲν
τῶν κατορθωμάτων μεταφέρων ἐπὶ τὰ δίκαια, ἔνια δὲ ἄξια σωφροσύνης
ἐπιδεικνύς, ἄλλα δὲ ἀνδρείας, ἕτερα δὲ πάλιν φρονήσεως. καὶ

1 περὶ ῥητορικῆς **A B p r v** : ῥητορικῆς **V** : τῆς ῥητορικῆς **K P b m**, *cf. p. 138, 11. C[a] p. 154, 1 sq. et sup. p. 88 et 88, 1*
συνέγραψεν **A V** : συνέγραψε **K P b m r p v** : συγγράψε (γ *prius ex corr.*) **B** (ας *supra*)
2 τὸν (τῶν **P**) νῦν εἰς ἐξήγησιν ἡμῖν προκείμενον **A K P V p r v** : τὸν ὑπὲρ τεσσάρων **B** : τὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν τεσσάρων καὶ τὴν κοινὴν ὑπὲρ τούτων ἀπολογίαν **b m** (*in hoc* ι *ultim. i. ras.*)
3 ἐμμεθόδως *Lenz*: ἐν μεθόδω **K P V b m**: ἐμμεθόδους **A B p r v**
3-4 ὀρβίας **P**, ʹ *et* ων *add.* **P**[2]
4 πλάτωνο͂ς: ο͂ς *vid. corr. ex* α **p**
τὸν πολιτικὸν **O** : τῶν πολιτικῶν **K**
4-5 ὑπογράψαντος **O** : ὑπογράψαντες **P**
5 προλαβόντες **O** : προσλαβόντες **A**
ἐδείξαμεν **O** : ἐδειξάμεθα **B**
6 ὄντας **O** : ὄντως **P**
σὺν **K P V b m** : νῦν **A p r v** *et ut vid.* **b**, *cf. Pan. p. 124, 4*
οἰκονομούμενος **O** : οἰκοδομούμενος **P**, *cf. C[a] p. 153, 12. 154, 1*
8 τὸ κατ' ἀρετὴν τοῖς ῥήτορσι τέλειον **O** : τοῖς κατ' (κατὰ **A**) ἀρετὴν ῥήτορσι τὸ τέλειον **A v**
9 τῶν **O** : *om.* **b m**
9-11 μετῆλθεν - ἀρξάμενος *om.* **A v**
10-11 ἀπὸ *alterum om.* **p r**; *de verbis* ἀπὸ τῶν πράξεων ἀπὸ τῶν ῥητόρων *idem iudicandum vid. quod de p. 133, 1,* ὑπεισέρχεται ὑποκρίνεται
11 τὸν πολιτικῶν **V**
12 μεταφέρων **B K P V b m** : ἀναφέρων (α *alterum i. ras., vid. fuisse* μετα *abbrev.*: *eras. et add.* ἀν) **r** : ἀναφέρων **A p v**
τὰ δίκαια **B K P V b m** : τὸ δίκαιον (τὸ *i. ras. et* ον *ut vid. i. ras.*) **r** : τὸ δίκαιον **A p v**
13 ἐπιδεικνύς **O** : ἀποδεικνύς **r v**
ἀνδρείας **A K P V p r** : ἀνδρίας **B b m v**
ἕτερα **O** : ἄλλα **V**
φρονήσεως: ν *i. ras.* **K**

οὕτως φαινόμενος ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ μέρος τὰς ἀρετὰς συνάγων τοῖς ῥήτορσι, πολιτικοὺς δοκεῖ δεικνύναι τοὺς περὶ Περικλέα καὶ Θεμιστοκλέα καὶ
27 Μιλτιάδην καὶ Κίμωνα. φεύγει μὲν γὰρ πανταχοῦ καθόλου περὶ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ πρὸς τὸν φιλόσοφον ἀνθορίζεσθαι, ἂν δέ πως ἀναγκασθῆι, πρὸς τὸ χρήσιμον πιθανῶς ποιεῖται τοὺς λόγους. ἐνδιατρίβει δὲ διόλου ταῖς πράξεσι, τὰς ἀποδείξεις ἑαυτῶι διὰ τούτων ἐρανιζόμενος καὶ πολιτικοὺς
28 αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῶν κατὰ μέρος εἶναι πιστούμενος. καὶ δοκεῖ ἐκ τῶν Ἰσοκράτους παραινέσεων εἰληφέναι τὴν μεταχείρισιν. ὡς γὰρ ἐκεῖνος περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ φρονήσεως καὶ ἀνδρείας δογματίζει μὲν οὐδὲν — οὐδὲ γὰρ λέγει τί δίκαιον ἢ τί σωφροσύνη πάλιν ἢ φρόνησις — ἐκ δὲ τῶν κατὰ μέρος παραγγελμάτων ἀρετὴν ἐμποιεῖ, πῆ μὲν δικαίας πράξεις ὑποτιθέμενος, πῆ δὲ διδάσκων, ὅπως ἂν εἶναι δόξαιμεν φρόνιμοι, πῆ δὲ τῶν ἡδονῶν ἀμελεῖν παραινῶν καὶ διὰ τούτων τὴν σωφροσύνην ἐργαζόμενος, οὕτως Ἀριστείδης ἐκ τῶν κατὰ μέρος πράξεων τὴν ἀρετὴν τῶν ῥητόρων ἐπιδεικνὺς πολιτικοὺς εἶναι τοὺς ἄνδρας βιάζεται, ἀντεγείρων

1 οὕτως **A K P m** : οὕτω **B V b p r v**
φαινόμενος **O** : φαινομένας **r**
μέρος **O** : μέρους **A**
2 δοκεῖ δεικνύναι **B K P V b m** : δεικνύναι δοκεῖ **A p r v**
τοὺς περὶ **O** : τὸν **b m**
καὶ *utrumque om.* **v**, *prius om.* **A**
2-3 τοὺς περὶ κίμωνα **B**
4 *post* πολιτικοῦ *add.* λόγου **A v**
5 πιθανῶς **O** : πιθανοὺς **p v**
6 διὰ τούτων **O** : διὰ τοῦτο **A**
8 μεταχείρισιν **B P b m v**: ι *i. ras. m. rec.* **K** : *aut* ι *in* η *aut* η *in* ι *corr.* **A** : μεταχείρησιν **V p r**
8-9 περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ σωφροσύνης **O** : περὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ δικαιοσύνης **B** : περὶ δικαιοσύνης **A**
9 ἀνδρείας **A K V p r** : ἀνδρίας **B P b m v**
10 τί **A B K b m p r v** : τὸ **P V**
post σωφροσύνη *lac. nulla ras., tum pergit* ἢ φρόνησις **r** : πάλιν *om. etiam* **A v**
ἢ τί φρόνησις ἢ τί ἀνδρεία ἐκ δὲ *Vat. 1336*
δὲ **O** : *om.* **B**
11 ἀρετὴν **K V b m** : ἀρετῆς (*sic*) **P** : τὴν ἀρετὴν **A B p r v**
11-12 πῆ· πῆ· πῆ **O** : πῆ· πῆ· ποῖ **p** : ποῦ· ποῦ· ποῦ **B**, *cf. Pan. p. 123, 1*
12 ὑποτιθέμενος: υ *i. ras.* **K**
δόξαιμεν φρόνιμοι **O** : φρόνιμοι δόξαιμεν **B**
13-14 ἐργαζόμενος **O** : ἀπεργαζόμενος **b**
14-15 οὕτως - ἐπιδεικνὺς *om.* **A** : οὕτω καὶ οὗτος πολιτικούς: *quae interced. om.* **r**

τῆι τῶν συλλογισμῶν ἀνάγκηι τὴν τέχνην καὶ τῆι μεταχειρίσει τὸν ψόγον μετατιθεὶς εἰς ἐγκώμιον. δείκνυσι γὰρ καὶ τὸ εἶδος τοῦ λόγου σαφῶς τὰ πράγματα κείμενα. καὶ νῦν, εἰ δοκεῖ, σαφέστερον τοῦτο ὀψώμεθα.

[Περὶ τοῦ εἴδους τοῦ λόγου]

29 Φασί τινες τῶν τὰς βαθείας ὑπήνας ἑλκόντων δικανικὸν εἶναι τὸν λόγον. πρῶτον μὲν ἐκ τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς· Ὑπὲρ τῶν δ' γάρ, φασιν, ἐπιγέ-
752 D. γραπται, ἡ δὲ ὑπὲρ / πρόθεσις ἀπολογίας ἐστίν. ἔπειθ' ὅτι ἀντιθέσεις ὁ λόγος ἔχει· καὶ τὸ δεύτερον δὲ μέρος ἀγῶνας κεκλήκασιν· οὔτε δὲ ἀγῶνες οὔτε ἀντιθέσεις ἐν ἄλλωι τινὶ ἢ δικανικῶι εἴδει συμβαίνουσιν· ἐκ δὲ
30 τούτων δῆλον, ὅτι δικανικὸς ὁ λόγος καλεῖται· πρὸς τούτοις φασίν,

8 περὶ τοῦ εἴδους τοῦ λόγου, δηλονότι τῆς καθόλου πραγματείας ὑπὲρ τῆς ῥητορικῆς Ἀριστείδου πρὸς Πλάτωνα *i. m.* **p**

1 τῇ **O** : πῇ **P**
μεταχειρίσει *vel* μεταχειρήσει *eodem fere modo quo p. 140, 8 codd.*
2 μετατιθεὶς **O** : μετατιθὲν **P**
ἐγκώμιον **O** : ἐγκώμια **r** (*ex p. 142, 13*)
καὶ *om.* **A**
3 *post* κείμενα *explic. f.* 4^{r} ; *sequuntur verba* ζη$^{τ'}$ μετὰ δύο φυ$^{λλ'}$ τοῦτο τὸ σῆμα [illegible] **r**; *f.* 4^{v} *vacat, sequitur in f.* 5^{r} Ἀριστείδου περί τε βίου καὶ τῆς τοῦ λόγου τέχνης **R**, *tum f.* 6^{r} περὶ τοῦ εἴδους τοῦ λόγου **R**
ὀψώμεθα **P V**: ὀψøμεθα *Vat. 1336 qui utrum voluerit* ω *an* ο *dubium est*: ὀψόμεθα **B K b m** : σκεψώμεθα **A P v**; *cf. Plat. Leg. XII 947 c. Lobeck Phryn. 734. Meisterhans Gramm. d. att. Inschr. § 78, 5 et p. 89, 1. 90 sq.*
post ὀψόμεθα *desin.* **m** : *hab.* H_1 **b**
4 περὶ (ερὶ **K**) τοῦ εἴδους τοῦ λόγου **K P R V** *et i. m.* **p** : *sine titulo et signo post vers. 3 pergunt* **A v**, *pergit etiam inscriptione i. m. addita* **p** : περὶ τοῦ εἴδους τῶν λόγων τῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν δ' *sine ulla auctoritate Vat. 1336*; *cf. p. 90*
5 φασί (ασί **K**) τινες **B K P R V** : φασὶ γάρ τινες **A p v**, *cf. p. 90 sq.*
τὰς **O** : *om.* **B**
τὰς βαθείας ὑπήνας: *cf.* Ὑπ. τ. δ' *II 280, 12 D. cum* Σ *et Sopatri Progymn. fr. 8 Rabe (in edit. Aphthonii 69, 133)*
5-6 τὸν εἶδος λόγον, *sed* εἶδος *del.* **A** (*ex vers. 2 ?*)
6 δ̄ **R** : τεττάρων **B** : τεσσάρων **A K P V p v**
φασὶν **K P R p v** : φασὶ **A** : φησὶν **B V**
7 ἀπολογίας ἐστὶν **K** : ἀπολογία ἐστὶν (ἐστὶ **B P**) **O** : ἀπολογία ἐστὶν (ἐστι **B P**) **O**, *potestne tolerari haec breviloquentia?* : ἀπολογίαν ἐνίσταται *inc. Vat. 1702*
8 κεκλήκασι **A P R**
8-9 ἀγῶνες οὔτε *om.* **R** *Vat. 1702, add. m. rec.* **R**
9 ἀντιθέσει **B**
post εἴδει *hab.* καὶ **K P R V** *sed expunx.* **K**, *eras.* **R**
συμβαίνουσι **B**
10 καλεῖται **B K P V** : ἐστὶν **A R** : ἐστὶ **p v** *Vat. 1702*
φασὶ **A B**

ὡς αὐτὸς Ἀριστείδης δικανικὸν εἶναι τὸν λόγον ὡρίσατο, ἤδη καὶ πρὸ ἡμῶν κατηγορίαν εἶναι τὸν Πλάτωνος λόγον ἀποφηνάμενος, ἔνθα φησὶ <<καὶ τὴν κατηγορίαν, ἣν ἐποιήσατο Μιλτιάδου καὶ Θεμιστοκλέους>>. πρὸς οὓς ἐροῦμεν ταυτί· πρῶτον μὲν ὡς ἀδιαφόρως οἱ παλαιοὶ κέχρηνται ταῖς προθέσεσιν. καὶ γὰρ τῆι ʽκατὰʼ ἀντὶ τῆς ʽὑπὲρʼ Δημοσθένης ἐχρήσατο, καὶ παρὰ τῶι Θουκυδίδηι ἐνηλλαγμένως πάσας εὑρήσεις τὰς προθέσεις
31 κειμένας, ὥστε οὐχ ἡ πρόθεσις δικανικὸν τὸν λόγον ποιεῖ. ἔπειτα αἱ ἀντιθέσεις οὐ μόνον ἐμπίπτουσιν ἐν δικανικαῖς ὑποθέσεσιν, ἀλλʼ ἤδη καὶ ἐν ἐγκωμιαστικαῖς, ὡς Ἰσοκράτης ἐν τῶι Βουσίριδι καὶ αὐτὸς Ἀριστείδης
32 ἐν Παναθηναϊκῶι. καὶ τὰς αἰτίας ἐκεῖ ἐξηγησάμενοί σοι πρῶτον τοῦτον τὸν λόγον εἰρήκαμεν· ἔφαμεν γάρ, ὅτι τὰ ἀμφίδοξα τῶν ἐγκωμίων, ἐὰν ἀκριβῶς ἔνδοξα κατασκευάσαι θελήσωμεν, ἐξ ἀντιθέσεως λαβόντες τὰ δοκοῦντα διαβολῆς ἄξια εἰς ἐγκώμια μετατίθεμεν, ἵνα τελείως ὁ λόγος
33 ἔνδοξος γένηται. πρὸς δὲ τὸ ἀγωνιστικὸν εἶναί τι μέρος τοῦ λόγου διὰ τὸ μάχιμον τὸ κατὰ τὴν σύνταξιν εἴρηται, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸ διʼ ἀγῶνος ἐσπούδασται ἀποδεῖξαι τοὺς ἄνδρας πολιτικούς. ἀγωνιστικὸς γὰρ λέγεται λόγος, ὅταν μαχίμως παρʼ ἡμῶν συντεθῆι· ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ καὶ τόπον Ὁμηρικὸν λαβόντες μαχίμως μεταφράσαι θελήσαιμεν. κυρίως μὲν γὰρ τὸ τῶν

5 ὅτι οὐ καλῶς εἶπον οἱ τὸν λόγον δικανικὸν εἶναι ἀποφηνάμενοι. οὐ γάρ ἐστιν εἴδους δικανικοῦ. ὅθεν οὐδὲ ὑπὸ μίαν τῶν ιγ̅ στάσεων πίπτει. *i. m.* **p**

2 τὸν πλάτωνος λόγον **O** : τῶν πλάτωνος λόγων **A v**
φησί: *II 157, 4-5 Dind.*
3 μιλτιάδης **P**
5 προθέσεσιν **R** : προυθέσεσιν (*voluitne* προσ?) **A** : προθέσεσι **O**
6 παρὰ **O** : περὶ **P**
τῶ **O** : *om.* **B**
πάσας εὑρήσεις **A R V p v** : εὑρήσεις πάσας **B K P**
7 αἱ *i. ras.* **K**[1]
8 ὑποθέσεσι **B**
9 ἐν *prius* **O** : *om.* **R V**
αὐτὸς **O** : ὁ αὐτὸς **B**
10-11 καὶ - ὅτι *om.* **B**
10 ἐξηγησάμενοι **O** : ἐξηγησάμενος **V** : ἐξηγησάμενος *vid. corr. in* ἐξηγησάμενοι σοι **v**
11 ἔφαμεν : *Pan. 122, 11 sqq.*
τὰ **O** : τὰ γὰρ *propter* καὶ - ὅτι *omissa* **B**
15 εἴρηται] εἰρήσεται *Lenz, cf. p. 107*
αὐτὸ **O** : αὐτῶ *vid. corr. in* αὐτὸ **p** : αὐτῶ **B K**
17 συντεθῆ **O** : τεθῆ *Vat. 1702*
17-18 ὁμηρικὸν λαβόντες *om.* **V**
18 θελήσαιμεν **K P V** : θελήσωμεν **A R p v** *et* **B** *sed in hoc* ω *ita ut inter* ω *et* αι *dubitavisse videatur*

ἀγώνων ὄνομα ὑπὸ δικανικῆς ὑποθέσεως τέτακται, ἐπειδὴ πρὸς ἀλλήλους
ἀγωνίζονται περὶ τῆς νίκης ἀμφότεροι. οὐδὲν δὲ ἄτοπον, καλούσης τῆς
753 D. χρείας / καί, ἐν ἐγκωμιαστικαῖς ὑποθέσεσιν ἢ φράσει χρήσασθαι ἀγω-
34 νιστικῆι ἢ μαχίμοις ἐπιχειρήμασιν. δεῖ δὲ πανταχοῦ τῶν πραγμάτων
τὴν φύσιν καὶ τῆς ὕλης τὸ εἶδος ὁρᾶν καὶ μὴ τῆι τῶν ὀνομάτων θέσει
παράγεσθαι. τὸ γὰρ λέγειν <<οὐκ εἰσιν οἱ ἄνδρες πολιτικοὶ>> δηλοῖ τούτους
οὐκ ἔχειν τὰς ἀρετάς, ὅπερ οὐ δικανικοῦ εἴδους, ἀλλὰ διαβολὴ τυγχάνει
τῆς φύσεως. οὐχ ὁ χαρακτὴρ τοίνυν τοῦ λόγου μάχιμος ὢν δικανικὸν
τὸ εἶδος ποιεῖ, ἀλλὰ τῶν πραγμάτων ἡ φύσις ἐγκωμιαστικὴν τὴν ὑπόθεσιν
35 δείκνυσιν. πρὸς δὲ τὸ ὅτι αὐτὸς Ἀριστείδης κατηγορίαν ὠνόμασεν,
ἐοίκασιν ἀγνοεῖν, ὅτι 'κατηγορία' ἀντὶ τοῦ 'καταγόρευσις' εἴρηται, ὡς καὶ
Ἀριστοτέλης τὸ τῶν Κατηγοριῶν βιβλίον ὠνόμασεν διὰ τὸ κατά τινος
πράγματος τὸ λεγόμενον ἀγορεύεσθαι. ὅθεν καὶ Ἀριστείδης κατηγο-

post θελήσωμεν *haec add.* ἢ τῆς ὕλης οὐκ οὔσης δικανικῆς τὴν κατά τινος κειμένην διαβολὴν μαχίμοις ἐπιχειρήμασι λῦσαι (**p** *Vat. 1702* : λύσαι **A R v**) θελήσωμεν (θελήσομεν **A**) **A R p v** *Vat. 1702*; *ex* ἢ *fortasse concludendum est haec verba non tam esse habenda pro additamento quam pro duplici lectione cuius auctoritas nulla est, cf. vers. 3 sq. et p. 94, 1*

1 ἀγών ὄνομα: ν ὄνο *i. ras.* **P**
ὑπὸ **O** : ἐπὶ **A P v** *Vat. 1702*
δέδεικται: *i. m.* τέτακται *Vat. 1336*; *haec verba fort. non sana, malim* ὄνομα ἐπὶ δικανικῆς ὑποθ. τέθειται, *cf. vers. 5 sq.*
2 τῆς νίκης **O** : νίκης **v**
3 ὑποθέσεσι **B**
χρήσασθαι **O** : χρῆσθαι **B**
4 ἐπιχειρήμασιν **A V** : ἐπιχειρήμασι **O**
5 θέσει **O** : ὑποθέσει **R** *Vat. 1702*
6 παράγεσθαι **O** *et ssc. m. rec.* **R** : παραγενέσθαι **R V**
οὔκ εἰσιν **B K P R V** : ὡς οὔκ εἰσιν **A p v** : λέγειν ὡς *om. Paris. 2952*
8 ὢν **O** : ὂν **V**
9 εἶδος **A B p v** *Vat. 1702* : εἶ/δος **R** : ἦθος **K P V**
10 δείκνυσιν **A V** : δείκνυσι **B K P R v** : δείκνυσι *corr. ex* δείκνυται **p**
τὸ: ο *i. ras.* **K**[1] : τοὺς **p** : *om.* **B**
αὐτὸς **K P R V p** : αὐτὸς ὁ **B** : ὁ αὐτὸς **A v**, *cf. Hom. Z 451 Soph. Phil. 484*
κατηγορίαν **O** : κατηγορίας **A v**
10-p. 144, 10. ὠνόμασεν - ἔφασαν **O** : εἶπε τὴν ἐξέτασιν πλάτωνος ἐοίκασιν ἀγνοεῖν ὅτι τὸ (*Laur. Abbat. 9*: *om.* **B**) κατηγορία ὄνομα ἐπαμφοτερίζει καὶ ποτὲ μὲν δηλοῖ τὰ κατά τινος ἀγορεύεσθαι, καθὸ λέγεται καί τις πραγματεία Ἀριστοτέλους κατηγορίαι· ποτὲ δὲ καταφορὰν δηλοῖ καὶ δύναται ἀμφοτέρως ἐκεῖ λαμβάνεσθαι. περιττὸν οὖν ἐντεῦθεν περὶ στάσεως λόγον ποιεῖσθαι· ἔνιοι μέντοι μετάστασιν εἶναι τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἔφασαν (εἶναι **B**) **B** *Laur. Abbat. 9*
12 τῶν: *aliquid eras.* **V**
ὠνόμασεν **A R V** : ὠνόμασε **K P p v**

ρίαν εἶπεν τὴν ἐξέτασιν Πλάτωνος διὰ τὸ τοὺς παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγους κατὰ
36 τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀγορεύεσθαι. εἰ δὲ δεῖ πρὸς τὴν λέξιν καὶ θεωρήματι χρήσα-
σθαι, Δημοσθενικῶς 'Αριστείδης τὴν ἐξέτασιν κατηγορίαν ὠνόμασεν,
ἵν' αὐξήσας τὸν λόγον τῆι λέξει καθάψηται Πλάτωνος ὡς κατηγοροῦντος,
37 οὐ δοκιμάζοντος. περιττὸν μὲν οὖν ἐντεῦθεν οἶδ' ὅτι καὶ περὶ στάσεώς
τινα λόγον ποιήσασθαι. εἰ γὰρ ἀποδέδεικται οὐ δικανικοῦ εἴδους ὁ λόγος,
οὔκουν πως στάσιν ἐπιδέξαιτο ἂν ἡ ὑπόθεσις. οὐ μὴν καὶ περὶ τούτου
ποιησόμεθα τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν, ἵνα μηδὲν ἀνεξέταστον ἦι.
38 τινὲς τῶν ἐμπρεψάντων ἐνδόξως ἐφ' ἡμῶν ὥσπερ τι μέγα καὶ σεμνὸν
ἐπινοήσαντες μετάστασιν εἶναι τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἔφασαν, ἔγκλημα προφέροντες
754 D. τὸ κατὰ Περικλέους λεγόμενον-«ἀργοὺς» γάρ, φησι, καὶ «φιλαργύρους»
'Αθηναίους / ἐποίησεν — καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν ἐπὶ τοὺς πρὸ αὐτοῦ μετάγουσι
ῥήτορας. οἶσθα δέ, ὅτι οὐκ ἔγκλημα λαμβάνεται παρὰ τοῦ Πλάτωνος τὸ
«ἀργοὺς καὶ φιλαργύρους», ἀλλ' ἡ πρώτη μὲν πρότασίς ἐστιν, ὅτι οὐκ
ἦσαν οἱ ἄνδρες πολιτικοί, ἡ δὲ τούτου κατασκευή· οὐδὲ γὰρ καλοὺς καὶ
ἀγαθοὺς 'Αθηναίους ἐποίησαν, τοὐναντίον δὲ καὶ κακούς, ἀργοὺς καὶ

10 ὅτι οὐ μετάστασίς ἐστιν ὁ λόγος, ὡς εἶπόν τινες τῶν σοφῶν *i. m.* **p**

1 εἶπεν **A R V** : εἶπε **K P p v**
3 Δημοσθενικῶς *illustratur Sopatri disputatione Schol. Hermog.* Στάσ. *IV 191, 18 sqq. W.*
4 τὸν λόγον τῇ λέξει **O** : τοῦ λόγου τὴν λέξιν **A** : τῷ λόγῳ τὴν λέξιν **v**
4-5 ὡς κατηγοροῦντος οὐ δοκιμάζοντος **O** : ὡς οὐ δοκιμάζοντος ἀλλὰ κατηγοροῦντος **A p v**
5 μὲν *sup. lin.* **p**
οἶδ' ὅτι καὶ **R** : εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι καὶ **K P V p** : οἶδα καὶ *Vat. 1702* : καὶ **A** : *om.* **v**
περὶ **O** : που **P**
6 δικανικοῦ **O** : ῥητορικοῦ **A v**; *cf. H₁ p. 160, 7*
7 οὔκουν πως *Keil* : οὐκοῦν (οὐκ οὖν **P R**) πῶς **O**
ἐπιδέξαιτο *Dindorfii* **N** : ἐπιδέξοιτο **A K R V p v** : ἐπιδείξοιτο **P**
οὐ μὴν **A P R V v** : οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ **K** : οὐκοῦν **p** *et ssc. m. rec.* **R**; *cf. p. 94, 3*
9 τινὲς **K P R V** : τινὲς γοῦν **A p v**; *cf. p. 94 sqq.*
11 φησι: *Plat. Gorg. 515 e*; *cf. H₁ p. 160, 7* : φασι: α *ex* η *corr. Paris. 2952, minus verisimile est propter 10* ἔφασαν *hic dici eos qui* τὴν ὑπόθεσιν *iudicaverunt* μετάστασιν
12 ἐποίησεν **A R V** : ἐποίησε **B K P p v**
πρὸ αὐτοῦ **p v** *et m. rec.* **R** : πρὸ αὐτῶν **B K P V** : πρὸ αυτῶν **R** : πρὸς αὐτοὺς **A**, *cf. p. 95, 1*
μετάγουσι **O** : προσάγουσι **A v**
13 οὐκ *om. sed ante versum add.* οὐχ ὡς **A**
14 ἡ πρώτη μὲν **B K P R V p** : ἡ μὲν πρώτη **A v**
15-16 καὶ ἀγαθοὺς **O** : κἀγαθοὺς **B**
16 καὶ *prius om.* **B** : ὡς *Vat. 1702,* καὶ *est i. q. vel, etiam*

39 φιλαργύρους ποιήσαντες. ὁ δὲ τὰ συνέχοντα τὴν παρὰ τῶι Πλάτωνι ζήτησιν μὴ νοῶν τὰς ἀποδείξεις λαβὼν εἰς ἐγκλήματα μετάστασιν εἶπεν τὴν στάσιν, ἵν' ἀδιορθώτωι πταίσματι περιπέσωμεν. ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἐν

40 ταῖς ἀντιθετικαῖς πρῶτον ἡμᾶς ὁμολογεῖν τὸ ἐπιφερόμενον ἔγκλημα, εἶθ' οὕτω μετάγειν εἰς ἕτερον. εἴτε οὖν τὸ μὴ εἶναι τοὺς ἄνδρας πολιτικοὺς ἐγκαλοῦσιν, ἀνάγκη διὰ τὴν μετάστασιν πρῶτον ὁμολογεῖν, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσιν πολιτικοί, ὅπερ Ἀριστείδης οὐ ποιεῖ διόλου τοὺς ἄνδρας κατασκευάζων πολιτικούς· εἴτε τὸ <<ἀργοὺς καὶ φιλαργύρους>> ἐγκαλεῖ, ἀνάγκη καὶ ταῦτα πρῶτον ὁμολογεῖν διὰ τὴν φύσιν μεταστάσεως, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀτοπώτατον.

41 ἔτι τὰ ἐν ταῖς ἀντιθετικαῖς ἐγκλήματα κατὰ φύσιν, οὐ κατὰ θέσιν ἐστίν, οἷον τὸ τεῖχος καθελεῖν ἢ τὸ[ν] ἵππον ἀνελεῖν ἐν ἀντιστάσει ἢ τὸ ἀποκτεῖναι τὸν υἱὸν ἐν ἀντεγκλήματι, τὸ μὴ πρεσβεῦσαι ἐν μεταστάσει,

x
κακούς ἀργούς **O** : κακούς (καλοὺς **B**) καὶ ἀργούς **B R** : ἀργούς καὶ κακούς *Vat. 1702*

1 ποιήσαντες **O** : ἐποίησαν *Vat. 1702* : *om.* **B**
ὁ: *obversatur idem qui p. 144, 9* τινὲς: οἱ δὲ **B**
τῶ πλάτωνι **R**, τοῦ πλάτωνος, *m. rec.* **R p**
2 νοῶν **O** : νοοῦντες **B**
λαβὼν εἰς **O** : ἔλαβον ὡς **B**
μετάστασιν **O** : καὶ μετάστασιν **B**
εἶπεν
εἶπεν **A V** : εἶπε **K P v** : εἶναι **R** : εἶπεν εἶναι **p** : εἶπον **B**
3 ἵν' - περιπέσωμεν *om.* **B**
ἀδιαρθρώτω **v**
γὰρ **O** : δὲ **B**
4 ἡμᾶς **O** : ἡμῶν **P**
4-6 τὸ - ὁμολογεῖν *om.* **B**
5 οὕτω **O** : οὕτως **p**
6-8 ἐγκαλοῦσιν - πολιτικούς *om.* **p**
6 διὰ **O** : δὴ *Vat. 1336*
εἰσὶν **B V** : εἰσὶ **O**
7 τοὺς ἄνδρας κατασκευάζων **B K P V** : κατασκευάζων τοὺς ἄνδρας **A R v** *Vat. 1702*
8 εἴτε τὸ **O** : εἰ δὲ τὸ **P**
ἐγκαλεῖ *om.* **B**
ἀνάγκη **O** : ἀνάγκη δὲ **P** : ἀνάγκη δὴ *Vat. 1336*
καὶ **O** : *om.* **B**
9 τὴν φύσιν τῆς μεταστάσεως **O** : τὴν τῆς μεταστάσεως φύσιν **A v**
9-10 ἀτοπώτατον **O** : ἄτοπον **B**
11 ἔτι τὰ **O** : ἔπειτα **p**
ante ἐγκλήματα *postea inser.* τὰ **p**
12 τὸ *Lenz*: τὸν **O**
ἐν **A B R V p v** : *om.* **K P**
13 τὸ **K P R V** : ἢ τὸ **A B p v** *et inser. m. rec.* **R**

τὸ τυπτῆσαι τὸν πατέρα ἐν συγγνώμῃ. πάντα ταῦτα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα
κατὰ φύσιν ἐστὶν ἐγκλήματα· καὶ γὰρ μόνα λεγόμενα καὶ χωρὶς περιστά-
σεως κατηγορίαν ποιεῖ· διὸ καὶ κατὰ φύσιν ἐγκλήματα εἴρηται παρ' ἡμῶν.
42 τὰ δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις στάσεσιν ἐκ τῆς ἔξωθεν ὕλης κατὰ θέσιν ἐγκλήματα
755 D. γίγνεται. μὴ νε/οσφαγεῖ γοῦν τις παρεστὼς οὐ κριθήσεται; τὸ ἐπανα-
τείνασθαι τὰς χεῖρας διὰ τὴν προϋπάρχουσαν ἔχθραν ὑβριστικὸν εἶναι
δοκεῖ. ἐὰν γοῦν περιέλωμεν τὴν ποιότητα, ὁ ἐπανατεινόμενος οὐκέτι
κρίνεσθαι δύναται. τὸ ἀποκτεῖναι μοιχὸν ἀνεύθυνον ὄν, διὰ τὴν ποιότητα
43 τοῦ τρισαριστέως εὐθύνεται. ἔστι συνιδεῖν, εἰ καὶ τὸ ἀργὸν καὶ φιλάργυρον
ἐγκλήματα κατὰ φύσιν ἐστὶν ἢ οὔ. ἴσμεν δέ, ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἀργίας ὑπέστη
γραφὴν οὐδὲ φιλαργυρίας, ἀλλὰ μισεῖται μὲν ταῦτα ὡς ἄτοπα, οὐ μὴν
κρίνεται. οὐκοῦν οὐδὲ τιμωρίαν τούτων ὥρισαν οἱ νόμοι. πῶς οὖν ἔτι
μετάστασις, μήτε τῶν ἐγκλημάτων ὄντων μήτε ὁμολογούντων ἡμῶν πρῶ-

2 ἐστὶν **O** : εἰσὶν *Vat. 1702*
μόνα **O** : μόνον **B**
καὶ χωρὶς **O** : χωρὶς **v**
4 στάσεσιν (-σι **B**) **A B R p v** : ἐνστάσεσιν **K P V**
5 γίγνεται **P R V** *et* **K** *sed in hoc* γ *postea vid. insert.* : γίνεται **A B p v**
μὴ **O** : μὴ γοῦν (γοῦν *alterum non om.*) **B**
νεοσφαγεῖ **O** : νεοσφαλεῖ **P V**; *cf. Hermog.* Π. στάσ. *p. 30, 20 R. et Sop. Schol. IV 88, 2 W.*
γοῦν *om. sed* οὖν *sup. lin. add.* **p**
κριθήσεται; *interpunx. Lenz*
5-6 ἐπανατείνασθαι **O** : ἐπανατείνεσθαι **p** *Vat. 1702*
6 τὰς **O** : *om.* **B**
-ό͜αν
προυπ χσ *coniunct. cum abbrev.* : σ *vid. m. rec.*, αν *ssc. m. rec.* **R**
post ἔχθραν *explic.* (*f. 6v*) **R**, *inc.* (*f. 7r*) **r**
7 ἐπανατεινόμενος **K P V v** *et* **A** *sed in hoc* ο *corr. ex* α : ἐπανατεινόμενος (α *sup. lin.*) **p** :
ἐπανατεινάμενος (ό *sup. lin.*) **r** : ἐπανατεινάμενος **B**
8 κρίνεσθαι **V p r** : κρίνασθαι **A B K P v**
ὄν **O** : ὂν **P**
8-9 μοιχὸν - τρισαριστέως *cf. Hermog.* Π. στάσ. *p. 30, 23 R. et Rhet. Gr. IV 99, 12-15 W.*
9 οὐ δύναται. (*lin. indux.*) εὐθύνεται **B**
ἔστι συνιδεῖν **P V** : ἔστιν οὖν συνιδεῖν **B** : ἔστιν ἰδεῖν **K** : ἔστιν οὖν ἰδεῖν **A p r v**
φιλάργυρον **O** : τὸ φιλάργυρον **B** *Vat. 1702*
10 κατὰ φύσιν : *cf.* H_1 *p. 160, 8 sqq.*
ὅτι **O** : *om.* **B**
οὐδεὶς ἀργίας (ἀργείας **V**) **O** : ἀργίας οὐδεὶς **p r**
11 οὐδὲ φιλαργυρίας *om.* **B**
12 ἔτι **K P V** : ἔ/τι **A** : ἔστι **B p r v**, *cf. p. 147, 12*
13 πρῶτον **A B P V v**: πρώτων **K p r**

τον τὰ παρὰ τῶν ἀντιδίκων λεγόμενα μήτε ὅλως ἐκ περιστάσεως γιγνομένων ἐγκλημάτων αὐτῶν; οὐκοῦν ταύτην πρῶτον ἐκβλητέον τὴν στάσιν.

44 ἄλλοι πραγματικῆς ὑποθέσεως εἶναι τὸν λόγον προήιρηνται λέγοντες ζητεῖσθαι, εἰ δεῖ πολιτικοὺς τοὺς ἄνδρας καλεῖν ἢ οὔ. ἴσμεν δέ, ὅτι ἐν τῆι πραγματικῆι ἐνεστώτων ἔτι καὶ ὑπαρχόντων τῶν πραγμάτων περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος ποιούμεθα ζήτησιν, εἰ δεῖ δοθῆναι τόδε ἢ ποιῆσαι τόδε ἢ ὀνομάσαι Περικλέα Ὀλύμπιον, τοῦ σκοποῦ τῆς ὑποθέσεως τὴν ἀναφορὰν πρὸς τὸ μέλλον ἔχοντος, κἂν γάρ τινα λόγον τῶν παρελθόντων ποιώμεθα, διὰ τὸ μέλλον αὐτῶν μνημονεύομεν τοῦ μέλλοντος τὸ κῦρος τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἔχοντος. ἐνταῦθα δὲ ὁποῖοί τινες ἦσάν ἐστιν ἡ ζήτησις, πότερον πολιτικοὶ ἢ οὔ, ὅπερ περὶ παρελθόντος ἔχει τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν. πῶς οὖν ἔτι πραγματικῆς ἂν ὁ λόγος γένοιτο στάσεως;

45 ἔτι καὶ τόδε ἄτοπον προσθεῖναι καλόν. ὑποθώμεθα γὰρ τὸν μὲν ἐγκωμιάζειν τινά, τὸν δὲ ψέγειν. οὐκοῦν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ζητηθήσεται,

4 ὅτι οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὴν πραγματικὴν ἀνάγεται *i. m.* **p**

1 παρὰ **O** : περὶ **B**
2 γιγνομένων **O** : γινομένων **B**
ταύτην πρῶτον **O** : πρῶτον ταύτην *Paris. 2952* : ταύτην **B**
4 πραγματι[κὸ] ὑπόθεσιν : κὸ *ex corr.* **p** : ὑπόθεσιν (*sed* πραγματικῆς) **r**; *de 4 sqq. cf. p. 97 sq.*
5 καλεῖν **B K P V** : καλεῖσθαι **A p r v**
7 δοθῆναι: *cf. Sopatrum* εἰς τὴν Ἑρμογ. Τέχν. V *91, 24 Walz*; *apud Hermog.* Π. ἰδ. *p. 38, 6 Rabe legitur* δοῦναι, *quam lectionem novit etiam Sop.* V *226, 24 Walz*
9 πρὸς **O** : ἐπὶ **v**
10 αὐτὸν **K**, αὐτῶν *corr. m. rec.* **K**
μνημονεύομεν **O** : μνημονεύωμεν **A**
11 ἦσαν **O** : εἰσι **B**
12 ὅπερ περὶ παρελθόντος **A K P V v** : ὅπερ παρελθόντος **r** *et* **p** *sed in hoc* αρ *i. ras.*, *fuit* ερι : ὁ περὶ παρεληλυθότος **B**
ἐπίσκεψιν **O** : ζήτησιν **B**
ἔτι **O** : ἔστι **r**
13 ἂν **K P V p r**: *om.* **A B v**
γένοιτο **O** : γένηται **P**
14 ἔτι **K P V p r v** : ἔτι δὲ **A B**, *cf. p. 148, 6*
τόδε **P V p r** : τόδε τὸ **A B K v**, *cf. Schmid Atticismus IV 65*
προ[σ]θεῖναι **P**
τὸν μὲν **O** : τοῦ μὲν **P V**
15 οὐκοῦν *i. ras. vid.* **A**
ζητηθήσεται: σε *i. ras.* **K**

756 D. πότερόν εἰσιν οὗτοι καλοὶ ἢ κακοί, κἀκ τούτου / πραγματικῆς στάσεως τὸ πανηγυρικὸν εἶδος γενήσεται; ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀτοπώτατον. ἴσμεν δέ, ὅτι ἐν ταῖς πανηγυρικαῖς ὑποθέσεσιν μέχρι τῶν παρελθόντων ὁ λόγος ἵσταται, ἐν δὲ τῆι πραγματικῆι πρὸς τὸ κατορθῶσαι τὰ μέλλοντα τὰ παρελθόντα λαμβάνομεν· ὥστε καὶ ταύτην ἐκβλητέον τὴν στάσιν.

46 ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις ἄλλοι φασίν, εἰ περὶ ὀνόματός ἐστιν ἡ ζήτησις, πότερόν εἰσι πολιτικοὶ ἢ οὔ, ὅρος ἡ στάσις. πρὸς οὓς ἐροῦμεν· ἕτερόν ἐστι λέγειν ‘πολιτικοί εἰσιν ἢ οὔ’, καὶ πότερον πολιτικὸν δεῖ καλεῖν ἢ οὔ. ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῶι πότερον πολιτικοί εἰσιν ἢ οὔ, μὴ ζητουμένου τοῦ ὀνόματος, ζητεῖται τὰ πράγματα, εἰ τάδε ὑπάρχει τινί. ἐὰν γὰρ τάδε ὑπάρχηι τινί, ἅπερ ἐν ἀρχῆι περὶ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ λέγοντες ὡρισάμεθα, οὗτος πολιτικός. ἐν δὲ τῶι πότερον πολιτικὸν δεῖ καλεῖν ἢ οὐ ὁμολογουμένων τῶν πραγμάτων ζητοῦμεν τὸ ὄνομα, πότερον δεῖ καλεῖν τῶιδε τῶι ὀνόματι τὰ ὑπάρχοντα πράγματα ἢ οὐ· ὅπερ ἐξ ἐναντίας ὑπάρχει τῶι λόγωι. οὐχ ὑφεστώτων γὰρ τῶν τοῦ πολιτικοῦ πραγμάτων κατὰ τὸν Πλάτωνα ζητοῦμεν, εἰ πολιτικοί
47 εἰσιν ἢ οὔ. ἔτι ἐν τῶι ὅρωι τὸ μὲν πέπρακται, τὸ δὲ λείπει, καὶ ὁμολογεῖται

6 ὅτι οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὴν ὁρικὴν στάσιν ἀνάγεται *i. m.* **p**

1 οὗτοι **A B p r v** : ὄῦτοι **P** : οὔτοι **V** : ὅτι **K**
ἢ κακοί **O** : κἀγαθοὶ **B**
2 ἀτοπώτατον **O** : ἄτοπον **B** : ἀτοπώτερον *Vat. 1336*
3 ὑποθέσεσιν **A K V** : ὑποθέσεσι **B p r v** : ὑποθεσι (*sic*) **P**
4 κατορθῶσαι **O** : κατορθώσειν **v**
5 στάσιν **O** : ἔνστασιν **p r**
6 ἔτι **O**: *om.* **B**
ἄλλοι φασὶν (-σὶ **A**) **O** : ἕτεροι λέγουσιν **B**
εἰ περὶ ὀνόματος **O** : εἰπὲ ὀνόματα **P**
7 *post* οὔ *comma, post* στάσις *punctum, post* ἐροῦμεν *colon pos. Lenz*: *post* οὔ *colon pos., post* στάσις *non interpunx., post* ἐροῦμεν *punctum pos. Dind.*
ἡ **O**: ἢ **P V**; *cf. Sopatrum in Rhet. Graec. IV 477, 8 sqq. Walz*
ἐροῦμεν **O** : ἔλεγε **B** : λέγομεν *Dind.*
8 λέγειν **O** : φάσκειν **B**
εἰσιν **B K P V** : *om.* **A p r v**
πολιτικὸν **O** : πολιτικούς **B**
9 τῶ **O** : *om.* **B**
πότερον **O** : ποτέρω **P**
10 ὑπάρχει (*sup.* ει *ssc.* η) **A**
11 ἅπερ - ὡρισάμεθα **O** : καθὼς εἴρηται **B**
ἐν ἀρχῆι: *p. 127, 5 sqq.*
περὶ **O** : *om.* **A v**
λέγοντες **K p r** : λέγοντος **A P V v**
12 πότερον **O** : πρότερον **P**
πολιτικὸν δεῖ **O** : δεῖ πολιτικοὺς δεῖ **B**
16 τὸ μὲν· τὸ δὲ **O** : τῶ μὲν· τῶ δὲ **P**

παρ' ἑκατέρων τό τε λεῖπον καὶ τὸ πεπραγμένον. δεῖ γὰρ τὰ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἄχρι τέλους τυγχάνειν ὁμολογούμενα οὕτως προστεθέντος τοῦ λείποντος ἀσύστατον γίνεσθαι ἔτι τὴν ὑπόθεσιν. ἐν δὲ τῶι Ὑπὲρ τῶν δ' οὔτε λείπει τι πρὸς τὴν τοῦ ὀνόματος θέσιν, ἀλλὰ τέλεια τυγχάνει τὰ πράγματα, οὔτε τί ἐστιν, ὃ προστεθὲν ἀσύστατον τὴν ὕλην ποιεῖ.

48 ἄλλοι παραπαίοντες ἀνασκευὴν λέγουσιν εἶναι τὸν λόγον. κατὰ δὲ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον πᾶσαν ἀντίρρησιν ἀνασκευὴν ὥρα καλεῖν. ἴσμεν δέ, ὅτι τῶν λόγων αἱ διαιρέσεις τὸ τέλειον ἢ ἐλλιπὲς δεικνύουσιν. εἰ μὲν οὖν τοιαύτη τοῦ λόγου τίς ἐστιν ἡ τομή, ὡς προγυμνάσματος ἐπέχειν διαίρεσιν,
757 D. καλῶς ἀνασκευὴν εἶναί φασιν. εἰ δὲ αἱ / πράξεις εἰσὶ τέλειαι καὶ ὕλης ἐγκωμιαστικῆς ἐστι πλῆθος ἐν τῶι λόγωι, πῶς ἀνασκευὴ τὸ τοιοῦτον ἂν ἔτι ῥηθείη; πῶς δὲ προγύμνασμα τοσοῦτο μέγεθος ὑποθέσεως; καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον.

49 λοιπὸν δέ ἐστιν εἰπεῖν, ὡς πανηγυρικὸς ὁ λόγος ἐστίν, εἰ καὶ

6 ὅτι οὐδὲ ἀνασκευὴ ἂν εὐλόγως ἡ τοσαύτη πραγματεία λέγοιτο *i. m.* **p**
14 ὅτι εἰς τὸ πανηγυρικώτερόν πως ἀπονεύει ἡ πραγματεία, ἐκράτησε δὲ μᾶλλον ἀντίρρησις λέγεσθαι, *i. m.* **p**

2 ἄχρι **O** : μέχρι *Dindorfii* **L**
2-3 *brevissime loquitur, quod spectat ad Hermog.* Π. στάσ. *37, 1 sqq. Rabe*
2 προστεθέντος **A K P V p** : προτεθέντος **r v** : προθεθέντος (*sup.* ο *add.* τ) **B**
ἀσύστατον, *cf. p. 99, 1*
3 γίνεσθαι ἔτι **O** : ἔτι γίνεσθαι **B**
δ **p** : δ^ων' **B** : τεσσάρων **A K P V r v**
5 προ^στεθὲν : τ *i. ras.* **A**
6 ἄλλοι **A B p r v** : ἀλλ' οἱ **K P V**
7 πᾶσαν ἀντίρρησιν ἀνασκευὴν : *cf. H₁ (161, 3 sqq.) et schol. III 456, 23 D. et Lenz Unters. 21. 120 sq.*
ο";ρα **A**
ὅτι **O** : ὅτε **A**
8 λόγων: λο *ex corr.* **p**
ἐλλιπὲς **A P V v** : ἐλλειπὲς *vid. corr. in* ἐλλιπὲς **K p** : ἐλλειπὲς **B r**
8-9 τοιαύτη τοῦ λόγου τίς ἐστιν **K P V** : τοιαύτη τοῦ λόγου ἐστὶν **B** : τοιαύτη τίς ἐστι τοῦ λόγου **A p r v**
10 ἀνασκευὴν **O** : ἀνασκευαστικὴν *Dindorfii* **L**
φησὶν **A**
αἱ *sup. lin.* **A**
cf. Sopatrum Rhet. Graec. IV 58 W.
τ''ελεῖαι **A** : τελεῖαι **r**
11 /τὸ **P**
12 τοσοῦτο **O** : τοσοῦτον **p r**
14 *cf. Alexand.* Π. ῥητορ. ἀφορμῶν *III 1 Spengel*
δὲ **O** : δὲ^H_o **r** : δὴ **v**
πανηγυρικῶς **V**, *corr. in scribendo* **V¹**
εἰ **O** : εἰ *corr. ex* ἢ **p** : ἢ **B**

τοῦτ' ἤδη σπερματικῶς ἡμῖν ἀποδέδεικται. πρῶτον μὲν τοίνυν ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς τρισὶν εἴδεσι τῆς ῥητορικῆς καὶ τόπον ὡρίσθαι καὶ πρόσωπα καὶ σκοπόν. τόπον μὲν δικαστήριον, βουλευτήριον, θέατρον· πρόσωπα δὲ κατήγορον, σύμβουλον, ἐπαινέτην· σκοπὸν δὲ τιμωρίαν, συμφέρον,
50 καλόν. ζητουμένου τοίνυν, πότερον οἱ ἄνδρες εἰσὶ πολιτικοὶ ἢ οὔ, οὐ δικαστήριον, οὐ βουλευτήριον πρόκειται, οὐ κατήγορος, οὐ σύμβουλος, οὐ τιμωρίαν ὁ λέγων, οὐ συμφέρον ἐπιζητεῖ, ἀλλὰ πρῶτος Πλάτων ἐν διαλέξει σκοπεῖ, πότερον οἱ ἄνδρες εἶχον τὰς ἀρετὰς ἢ οὔ, δικαιοσύνην λέγω, σωφροσύνην, ἀνδρείαν καὶ φρόνησιν, ἅπερ ἔχει συλλαβὼν ὁ πολιτικός. καὶ ὁ μὲν φιλόσοφος ἀναιρεῖ τὸ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἔχειν τὰς ἀρετάς, τουτέστιν εἶναι πολιτικούς, Ἀριστείδης δὲ τίθησιν. καὶ ὁ μὲν τόπος θεάτρωι παρέοικεν, οἱ δὲ διαλεγόμενοι ἐπαινέταις, σκοπὸς δὲ τὸ γεγενῆσθαι καλούς. καὶ διαλέγεται Πλάτων, οὐ κρίνει, καὶ ὁ Ἀριστείδης ἐν ἀκροαταῖς ποιεῖ τὸν λόγον, οὐκ ἐν δικάζουσιν. ὥστε δῆλον ἐκ τούτων, ὡς πανηγυρικῆς ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ὑποθέσεως.

1 τοῦτ' ἤδη **O** : τοῦτο ἤδη **v** : τοῦτον εἴδη **A**
2 εἴδησι **V**, *corr.* V^1
τόπον **O** : τὸν τόπον **p r**
πρόσωπα **O** : πρόσωπον **B** (*item* 3)
3 δικαστήριον **O** : τὸ δικαστήριον **p r**
4 *cf. Sopatrum in Rhet. Graec. IV 51, 26 sqq. W.*
5 ζητουμένου **O** : ζητοῦμεν **A v**
ἄνδρες **O** : ἀνδρεῖοι **v**
εἰσὶ πολιτικοὶ **O** : πολιτικοί εἰσιν **B** : πολιτικοὶ **v**
6 πρόκειται : ο *i. ras.* V^1
7-8 πλάτων ἐν διαλέξει (διαλέγει **P**) **B K P V** : ἐν διαλέξει πλάτων **A p r v**
9 λέγω **O** : λέγει **B**
ἀνδρείαν **O** : ι *i. ras.* **P** : ἀνδρίαν **B v**
10 ἀναιρεῖ **O** : ἀνερεῖ **r**
11 τίθησιν **A V** : τίθησι **O**
12 οἱ/ **K**
ἐπαινέταις *coll. vers. 4 Lenz* : ἀκροαταῖς **O** (*ex 14*), *cf. p. 18*; *Alexand.* Π. ῥητορ. ἀφορμῶν *III 2, 6 Spengel* τὸ δὲ τῶν ἐγκωμίων εἶδος οὔτε αὐθέντας ἔχει οὔτε κριτάς, ἀλλὰ μόνον ἀκροατάς *non est quod conferatur, propterea quod Alexand. dicit de eis qui audiunt, Sopater autem de eis qui dicunt* (διαλεγόμενοι)
13 ὁ **B K P V** : *om.* **A p r v**
14 ποιεῖ **B P V p** : ποιεῖται **A K r v**
οὐ δικάζουσιν : κ ἐν *sup. lin. add.* **v**
ὥ^{σ}τε **A**
15 ὡς **O** : ὅτι **B**
πανηγυρικῆς **O** : πανηγυρικὸς **r**
ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ὑποθέσεως **O** : ἐστιν ὑποθέσεως ὁ λόγος **A v**

51 ταῦτ' ἐγώ σοι Σώπατρος ἐπιδίδωμι, ὅσα γε ἔμαθον παρὰ τῶν διδασκάλων 'Αθήνησι καὶ ὅσα μεθ' ἑτέρων ζητῶν καὶ ἐξ ἀναγνωσμάτων ποικίλων συνήγαγον.

1-3 ταῦτ' - συνήγαγον *hab.* **A B p v**, *non hab.* **K P V r** : *pro his verbis hab.* καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον (τοσούτον **V**) **K P V r** : *eadem post* συνήγαγον *add.* **A p v**; *sequitur libellus* περὶ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος καὶ τῆς ἀριστείδου κατὰ τὸν λόγον φύσεως **P V**, περὶ δὲ *eqs.* (*cf. p. 153*) **A v** : περιττὸς δὲ καὶ ἐνθυμηματικὸς *eqs.* **p r** : περὶ τῆς ἐν λόγοις ἰδιότητος ἀριστείδου τοῦ ῥήτορος *i. m. adscr.* **p**; *cf. p. 100-106*

THE TREATISE C•

CODICES

A =Vat. graec. 1899 (post Pan.)

K =Vat. graec. 74 (post Te., cf. ad p. 151, 1-3)

P =Paris. Bibl. Nat. graec. 2948 (post Te., cf. ad p. 151, 1-3)

V =Marc. graec. App. VIII 7 f. 8^v (post Te., cf. ad p. 151, 1-3)

a =Ambr. A. 175 sup. (post Pan.)

p =Pal. graec. 90 (post Pan.)

r =Vat. graec. 1298 (**R**) m. rec. (post Te., cf. ad p. 151, 1-3)

v =Vat. graec. 76 (post Te., cf. ad p. 151, 1-3)

Nusquam fere in apparatu repetivi quae ad C adnotavi; itaque et textus et apparatus illic passim conferendi sunt.

1 Περὶ δὲ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος καὶ τῆς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις Ἀριστείδου φύσεως.
[— τοῦτο γὰρ παρήκαμεν ἐν τοῖς ἄνω εἰπεῖν —] ἤδη μὲν Λογγῖνος καὶ
πάντες οἱ κριτικοὶ πολλὰ προειρήκασιν, ὡς περιττός, ὡς γόνιμος, ὡς
ἐνθυμηματικὸς τυγχάνει καὶ βίαιος καὶ καθόλου τὸν Δημοσθένην μιμού-
μενος. ὅμως δὲ καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν ὀλίγα πρὸς τὸ παρὸν προστεθήσεται.
2 φιλότιμός ἐστιν ὁ ἀνὴρ πανταχοῦ καὶ χαίρων καιναῖς ὑποθέσεσιν
καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πρώτους τῶν παλαιῶν ταῖς ῥητορείαις μαχόμενος, Ἰσο-
κράτην Δημοσθένην Θουκυδίδην Ἡρόδοτον, καὶ πρὸς τὸν κορυφαῖον
3 τῶν φιλοσόφων Πλάτωνα. οὕτως οὖν ταῖς ὕλαις ἐφαμίλλους εὑρίσκεται
τοὺς λόγους καὶ τῆι τῶν ἐπιχειρημάτων πυκνότητι δημοσθενίζει ἐν-
θυμηματικὸς ὢν πανταχοῦ καὶ φιλόνικος, ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἀγῶσι τὸ βίαιον,
ἐν δὲ τῶι χαρακτῆρι τὸ μάχιμον ἐνδεικνύμενος. ὅθεν κἀν ταῖς οἰκονομίαις
εὑρίσκεται πιθανώτατος καὶ μόνηι τῆι τάξει πολλάκις πρὸς τὸ κατορθοῦν
ἃ βούλεται χρώμενος. τὴν γοῦν ἀκολουθίαν τῶν προειπόντων ἐν οἷς
ἀντιλέγει πολλάκις ἀναιρῶν καὶ τοῖς δευτέροις ὡς πρώτοις μαχόμενος
καθάπερ ἐν κατόπτρωι τὴν τέχνην ἄντικρυς ἡμῖν ἐπιδείκνυσιν τὴν νίκην

titulus Περὶ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος καὶ τῆς ἀριστείδου κατὰ τὸν λόγον φύσεως **K** *Paris. 2953*

1 δὲ *retractatione perfecta auctor nescio an relicturus non fuerit*
τῆς: η *i. ras. paulo ampliore, fuit* οι **A** : τ *i. ras.* **K**
2 τοῦτο - εἰπεῖν *om.* **K V a v** : *hab.* **A P R p**, *cf. p. 103*
3 ὡς περιττὸς **K P V a v**, *deest in* C., *cf. p. 103*
4 ἐνθυμηματικῶς **P**
καὶ καθόλου **K P V a** : καθόλου **A v**
5 προ^{σ}τεθήσεται **A**
6 ὁ ἀνὴρ **O** : ἀνὴρ **A** *cui lectioni subesse vid.* ἀνὴρ
ὑποθέσεσιν **V** : ὑποθέσεσι **O**
9 πλάτωνα **A K v** : τὸν πλάτωνα **P V a**, *recte?*
οὕτως οὖν **V** : οὕτω γοῦν **A v** : οὕτ^{o}ως οὖν **a** : οὗτος οὖν **K** : εἶτα οὖν **P**
εὑρίσκεται **P V a** : εὑρίσκεται πλέκων **K** : εὑρίσκει **A v**
10 *post* λόγους *colon pos., tum add.* τριῶν **a** : ποιῶν *Vat. 1336*
ἐπιχειρημάτων **O** : ἐνθυμημάτων C *qui* ἐνθυμηματικὸς ὢν *eqs. non hab.*
10-11 περιττὸς δὲ (*cf. 3*) καὶ ἐνθυμηματικὸς ὢν *incip.* **p r**
11 φιλόνεικος **O**
12 *ante* τὸ μάχιμον *add.* φαίνεται **p r**
κἀν **O** : καὶ *Vat. 1702*
13 πιθανότατος **a**
τῆι *om.* **P**
15 δευτέροις πρώτοις χρώμενος *Paris. 2005*
16 ἐπιδείκνυσιν **V** : ἐπιδείκνυσι **O** : ἐπιδεικνύει *Vat. 935*

4 ἐξ οἰκονομίας κερδαίνουσαν. τοῦ γοῦν Πλάτωνος μετὰ τοὺς περὶ τῆς
ῥητορικῆς λόγους διαλαβόντος, ὡς οὐκ ἦσαν οἱ ἄνδρες πολιτικοὶ οὐδὲ
ᾔδεσαν χρήσασθαι πόλει, ἐπαγαγόντος δὲ δεύτερον τὸ μὴ βελτίους τοὺς
Ἀθηναίους πεποιηκέναι, μόνας δὲ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν ηὐξηκέναι τοῖς
πολιτεύμασιν, Ἀριστείδης τὸ μὲν δεύτερον τίθησι πρότερον, τῶν προσώ-
πων προκατασκευάζων τὴν σύστασιν καὶ κατασκευάζων αὐτῶν ἀξιό-
πιστον τὴν ποιότητα καὶ δεικνὺς κατὰ μέρος, ὡς κόλακες οὐκ ἐτύγχανον
οὐδὲ τῶι δήμωι πρὸς τὰς ἐπιθυμίας συνέτρεχον, ὅπερ ἔργον τῶν πρὸς
5 κολακείαν πολιτευομένων ἐστίν. ἐξετάζει δὲ δεύτερον αὐτῶν κοινῆι τὴν
ποιότητα καὶ θερμῶς ἀγωνίζεται, ὅτι καὶ πολιτικοὶ πάντες ἐτύγχανον.
ἔχων γὰρ ἤδη προσυσταθέντα τοῖς κατὰ μέρος ἐγκωμίοις τὰ πρόσωπα
κοινῆι λοιπὸν ἐν τῶι δευτέρωι μέρει πρὸς τὸν φιλόσοφον ἀγωνίζεται.
τόνδε γὰρ ἂν εἴποι τις τὸν λόγον πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιζητοῦντας μαθεῖν, διὰ τί
6 τῶν ἀγώνων προτέτακται τὰ ἐγκώμια. πλὴν οὐ μόνον ἐν ταῖς ὑποθέσεσιν
τυγχάνει καινοπρεπής, ἀλλ' ἤδη καὶ καινῶν σχημάτων εὑρετής ἐστιν.
τὸ γοῦν χιαστὸν σχῆμα κατὰ τὸν Παναθηναϊκὸν λόγον πρῶτος ἐξεύρηκεν
καὶ καθόλου πρὸς τοὺς λόγους ἀγωνιστικὴν ἔχων τὴν φύσιν καὶ σχημάτων

1 τοὺς **A K a p r v** : *om.* **P V**
1-2 περὶ τῆς ῥητορικῆς **A p r** : περὶ ῥητορικῆς **v** *Vat. 1702* : τῆς ῥητορικῆς **K P V a** : ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς *Vat. 935* : ῥητορικοὺς *Vat. 77, cf. Te. (p. 139, 1)*
2 διαλαβόντος = *cum Plato exposuerit*
ἦσαν **O** : ἤκουσαν *Paris. 2005*
πολικοὶ **P**
3 πόλει **O** : τῇ πόλει **K** *Paris. 2005 Vat. 1702*
τὸ **O** : ὁ **P**
6 κατασκευάζων: κ *prius i. ras.* **K**
7 *post* ποιότητα *desin. Vat. 77, sequitur Pan. p. 121 sqq.*
8 /ἔργον: ο *i. ras.* **K**
9 αὐτῶν **O** : αὐτὴν *Vat. 1702*
10 ποιότητα: οιο *i. ras.* **K** : π/ιότητα: ι *vid. i. ras.* **P**
θερμὸς **P**
ἐ.ύγχανον: ε *i. ras.* **K**
11 προσυσταθέντα **A K p r** : προσσυσταθέντα **P** : πρὸς συσταθέντα **V** : προσ-ταθέντα **v**
12 κοινῇ **O** : κοινὴν *Vat. 1702*
13 ἂν *om.* **A v**
ἐπιζηιοῦντας: ιζη *i. ras.* **K**
14 ὑποθέσεσιν **V** : ὑποθέσεσι **O**
15 ἐστιν **V** : ἐστι **O**
16 χιαστὸν σχῆμα *sed i. m.* σχῆμα χιαστικ **V**
ἐξεύρηκεν **V** : ἐξεύρηκε **A K P a** : ἐξεῦρε **p r v**

7 ἀγωνιστικῶν εὑρετὴς γεγένηται. τὴν δὲ λέξιν κύριος ἀσφαλὴς ἀρχαῖος σαφὴς οὐδὲν ἐκ τῆς Ἀσιάδος ἔχων ὑπόκενον ἢ κοῦφον οὐδὲ ταῖς τροπικαῖς τῶν λέξεων ὡς ἔτυχεν χρώμενος οὐδὲ φαινόμενος τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν ἐπιπολῆς, ἀλλὰ βαθὺς ὢν πανταχοῦ καὶ τῆς λέξεως πλείονα διδοὺς ἐννοεῖν. ὃ γὰρ ὡς ἴδιον Δημοσθένους κατενοήσαμεν, τοῦτο ἐπ' ἀκριβείας τῶν νεωτέρων σοφιστῶν οὗτος μόνος μεμίμηται. κινῶν γὰρ οὐκ ἀναπαύει τὸν λόγον, ἀλλὰ τῶι γονίμωι τῆς φύσεως χρώμενος πλέον ἐπαγωνίζεται, καθάπερ ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸ ἀγωνιστικὸν εἶδος τῶν λόγων τελῶν, ὥστε ἔχειν ἀρύεσθαι τῶν ἐπιχειρημάτων παρ' αὐτοῦ δαψιλέστερον πρὸς τὴν χρείαν, ὅσα τις καὶ βούλεται.

9 [ταῦτ' ἐγώ σοι Σώπατρος ἐπιδίδωμι, ὅσα γ' ἔμαθον παρὰ τῶν διδασκάλων Ἀθήνησιν καὶ ὅσα μεθ' ἑτέρων ζητῶν καὶ ἐξ ἀναγνωσμάτων ποικίλων συνήγαγον.] ἀλλ' ὥρα λοιπὸν ἐπ' αὐτὴν τῶν ἐδαφίων ἐλθεῖν ἐξέτασιν.

1 ἀγωνιστικῶν **O** : ἀγωνιστικὴν **P** : ἐγκωμιαστικῶν *Vat. 1702*
κύριος **O** : κυρίως **v** : *om. Paris. 2952*
ἀσφαλὴς **O** : *om.* **p r**
2 ἀσιάδος **K** *sed* ἀσιάδ *i. ras. artiore, et* **P a** *Paris. 2005. 2952. 2953* : ἀσίας **A V p r** : ἀσί ^{ας} / **v**
ὑπόκενον **O** : ὑποκαινον (ε supra) **p r** : κενὸν *Vat. 1702*
ἢ **O** : οὐ **A v**
3 ἔτυχεν **P V** : ἔτυχε **O**
4 ἐπολῆς (πι supra) **P**
διδοὺς **O** : δοὺς **p r**
5 ἐννοεῖν **O**
ὃ **O** : ἢ **P**
6 κινῶν **r** *et* **p** *sed in hoc i. m.* γρ. νικῶν : νικῶν **O**
8 τῶν λόγων **O** : τὸν λόγον **A**
τελῶν **A K P V a** : προτελῶν **v** : τελειῶν *Vat. 935* : *om.* **p r**
9 δαψιλέστερον **A p r v** : δαψιλεστέρων **K P V a**
11-13 ταῦτ' - συνήγαγον *uncis seclus. Lenz* : *hab.* **O**, *cf. p. 99 sqq.*
11 γ' ἔμαθον **A p r v** : γε μαθὼν **K P V a**
τῶν **O** : *om.* **A v**
12 ἀθήνησιν **V** : ἀθήνησι **O**
ἑτέρων **O** : ἑταίρων **V**
13 ἀλλ' ὥρα: *cf. p. 104*
ἐπ' αὐτὴν τῶν **A K V v** : ἐπ' αὐτῶν **P** : ἐπ' αὐτὴν τὴν τῶν **p r**
ἐδαφίων **O** *sed* ι *i. ras.* **P** : ἐδάφων *Vat. 935* : ἐδαφιαίων *Vat. 1702, cf. Liddell-Scott s.* ἔδαφος *4. 'text of a manuscript'*

THE HYPOTHESIS H_1

quae est apud Dindorfium III 435 sqq. H_2
cf. p. 4 sqq.

CODICES

A =Vat. graec. 1899

L =Laur. 60, 9

M=Marc. graec. 423

P =Pal. graec. 319

R =Vat. graec. 1298

V =Marc. graec. App. VIII 7

b =Vat. Regin. 120

l =Laur. 60, 6

m=Marc. graec. 424

p =Pal. graec. 90

r =Vat. graec. 1298 **(R)** m. rec.

v =Vat. graec. 76

sine ulla fere auctoritate est Paris. Bibl. Nat. graec. 2952

‘ΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ ΤΟΥ ‘ΥΠΕΡ ΤΩΝ Δ’

435 D. 1 Πλάτων ὁ ’Αρίστωνος ἐπισημότατος ἐν φιλοσοφίαι γενόμενος ἐζήτησε
τὸν φιλόσοφον βίον δεῖξαι πάντων καλλίονα, πάντας ἐπὶ φιλοσοφίαν
προτρεπόμενος. καὶ ἐπειδὴ ὁ τῶν τυράννων βίος καὶ ὁ τῶν ῥητόρων ἐν
ταῖς πόλεσιν ὡς δυνατὸς ἐθαυμάζετο, συνέγραψέ τινα διάλογον, Γοργίαν
ἐπικαλούμενον — τοῦτο γὰρ ὄνομα τῶι διαλόγωι — ἐν ὧι διαβάλλει τὸν
τῶν ῥητόρων καὶ τῶν τυράννων βίον ὡς φαῦλον καὶ ἄδικον. καὶ πρῶτον
μὲν διαβάλλει τὴν ῥητορικήν, τουτέστιν τὴν τέχνην· εἶθ’ οὕτως αὐτοὺς τοὺς
ῥήτορας ἐν παραδείγματος μέρει — οὐ γὰρ προηγουμένως οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀρχῆς
τοῦτο προθέμενος — καὶ τοὺς δοκοῦντας εὐδοκιμεῖν ἐν τῆι τέχνηι, τούτους
ὁ Πλάτων ἐξελέξατο, Θεμιστοκλέα, Μιλτιάδην, Κίμωνα, Περικλέα,
βουλόμενος διὰ τῆς τούτων διαβολῆς πάντας διαβαλεῖν τοὺς ῥήτορας.
ὅταν γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες εὐδόκιμοι φαῦλοι φανῶσιν, πῶς οὐκ ἀνάγκη
2 πάντας συνδιαβάλλεσθαι; πρὸς ταύτην τὴν κατηγορίαν, ἤτοι διαβολήν,

1 ὑπόθεσις τοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν τεσσάρων **L v** : ἡ ὑπόθεσις τοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν τεσσάρων **A** : ὑπόθεσις ὑπὲρ τῶν δ̄ **M** : προλεγόμενα τοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων **V** : προλεγόμενα ὑπὲρ τῶν τεσσάρων **p r** : ἑτέρα ὑπόθεσις *Vat. 77 et Pal. 29 sed in hoc* τοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν τεσσάρων *add. al. m.*

2 ὁ ἀρίστωνος *sup. lin. al. m. add.* **A**, *in textu* **M l m p r** : *om.* **A L P V b v**
ἐζήτησε: ζ *i. ras.* **l**

3 δεῖξαι : δεῖ *i. ras.* **A**
πάντων: π *i. ras.* **V**
καλλίονα : ν *i. ras.* **l**
φιλοσοφίαν **L M P V b m v** : σοφίαν **l** : φιλοσοφία **A p r**, *cf. p. 19 et e.g. Plat. Euthyd. 307 a Lycurg. Leocr. 10*

4 καὶ ὁ **A M V l p r v** : καὶ **L P b m**
ἐν *om.* **r**

5 ὥσπερ **l**
δυνατὰ **r**
διάλογόν τινα **v**

6 ἐπικαλούμενον **A M V l p r v** : οὕτω καλούμενον **L P b m**, *cf. p. 22*
τῶ (οῦ) διαλόγω (ου) **L**

6-7 τὸν τῶν ῥητόρων καὶ τῶν τυράννων **A L V l p r v** : τὸν τῶν ῥητόρων καὶ τυράννων **P b m** : τὸν τῶν τυράννων καὶ τῶν ῥητόρων **M** *qui id egit ut tyrannis principem daret locum*

8 μὲν **A L M P b l m v** : *om.* **V p r**
τουτέστιν **P** : τουτέστι **O**

9-10 ἐν ἀρχῇ καὶ τοῦτο *Paris. 2952*

10 τοῦτο προθέμενος **O**: (προ) θέμενος τοῦτο **r** : θέμενος **p**
καὶ *om.* **L**

11 κίμωνα περικλέα (-αία **V**) **O** : κίμωνα καὶ περικλέα **L P l m**

13 φανῶσιν *Paris. 2952* : φανῶσι **O**

14 συνδιαβάλλεσθαι **O** : διαβάλλεσθαι **l** *Paris. 2952*

ὁ Ἀριστείδης ἐνίσταται. καὶ ἤδη μὲν δύο λόγους Ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς συνέγραψε, βουλόμενος δεῖξαι αὐτὴν πρῶτον μὲν κρείττονα τέχνης καὶ ὑπὲρ τέχνην· εἶτα ὡς ἐν παρέργωι καὶ τέχνην ἀπέδειξεν. ἅτε δὴ οὖν /
436 D. συμπληρώσας τὴν ὑπὲρ τῆς τέχνης ἀπολογίαν καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ῥητόρων μέτεισιν ἀπολογίαν. καὶ ἔστι τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ λόγου καθάπερ ἐν δευτερολο-
3 γίαι, ὅπερ εὐθὺς ἐν τῶι προοιμίωι ἐπισημαίνεται. ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς ἐκεῖθεν κατασκευῆς οὕτω τὴν διάνοιαν εἴληφε λέγων· «παραιτεῖσθαι μὲν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅτι δεῖ πολλάκις», ὡς ἤδη δηλονότι ἐν τῶι Ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς λόγωι ἱκανὴν τὴν παραίτησιν ποιησάμενος. διὸ καὶ σύντομον ἐποιήσατο τὸ προοίμιον, ὥσπερ ἔχομεν καὶ παρὰ τῶι ῥήτορι ἐν ταῖς δευτερολογίαις, ἔν τε τῶι Κατὰ Ἀνδροτίωνος καὶ τῶι Πρὸς Λεπτίνην· ἐκεῖθεν γὰρ δίκαιον ἀκολουθοῦντα ποιεῖσθαι τὴν διαίρεσιν.

4 καὶ αὕτη μὲν τοῦ λόγου ἡ ὑπόθεσις· τὸ δ' εἶδος τοῦ λόγου πολλὴν ἔχει τὴν ζήτησιν, ποίου ἄρα καὶ εἴδους τῆς ῥητορικῆς καθέστηκεν. ὅτι μὲν οὖν οὐ τοῦ συμβουλευτικοῦ, πρόδηλον. λείπεται τοίνυν ἑνὸς τῶν ἑτέρων εἶναι τὸν λόγον. οἱ μὲν οὖν τοῦ ἐγκωμιαστικοῦ φασιν εἶναι τὸν λόγον, εἰς τὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀποβλέποντες ἐγκώμια. ἀλλ' οὐ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐγκωμιαστικὸς

13 περὶ τοῦ εἴδους τοῦ λόγου ὁποῖόν ἐστι ζητητέον *i. m.* **p**
16 ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι τῆς ἐγκωμιαστικῆς ἰδέας ὁ λόγος ὁ ὑπὲρ τῶν τεσσάρων, καὶ ἡ ἀπόδειξις πολλαχῶς *i. m.* **p**

1 μὲν δύο **L M P b l m** : δύο μὲν **p r** : μὲν δέκα **A V v**
2 αὐτὴν πρῶτον μὲν κρείττονα **A M V l p r v** : ταύτην κρείττονα **L P b m**
ης
τέχνης **A L M V b l m v** : τέχν··ς (·· *aliquid corr.*) **P** : τέχνην **p r**
3 εἶτα **M P b m v** : καὶ εἶτα **A L V l** : εἶτα δὲ **p r**
8 οἶδ' **O** : οἶδα **A**; *II 156, 3 sq. D.*
πολλάκις *om.* **l**
9 καὶ **O** : τὸ **P**
11 ἔν τε τῶι *om.* **V** : τῶι *om.* **P** : ταῖς *add. i. m.* $\mathbf{P}^2$
12 ἀκολουθοῦντα **A L M P b l m v** : ἀκολουθοῦντας **V p r**
ποιεῖσθαι **A M P m p r v** : ποιῆσθαι **V** : ποιήσασθαι **b l** : ποιῆσαι **L**
13 τοῦ λόγου ἡ ὑπόθεσις **A L V b l p r v** : ἡ τοῦ λόγου ὑπόθεσις **M P m**
post ὑπόθεσις *desin. argumentum, sequitur schol. III 356, 23 D.* τὸ δὲ προοίμιον **m**
14 καὶ **A L M V l p r** : *om.* **P b v**
τῆς *om.* **l**
κατέστηκε *et tum om.* ὅτι - *16* λόγων **M**
οὖν *om.* **P**
16 οἱ **O** : τινὲς **M**
φασιν **O** : φησιν **M**
τὸν λόγον **O** : *om.* **P b**
17 καὶ *om.* **P**

ὁ λόγος· οὐ γάρ, ἔνθα καὶ ἐγκώμια ἔχομεν, ἤδη καὶ τὸ εἶδος ἐγκωμιαστικόν. εἰ δὲ μή, οὐδὲν ‹ἂν› ἐκώλυε τὸν Περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου λόγον ἢ τὸν Πρὸς Λεπτίνην τοῦ ἐγκωμιαστικοῦ τυγχάνειν· πανταχοῦ γὰρ δι' ἐγκωμίων προάγεται ἀμφοτέρων τῶν λόγων ἡ διαίρεσις. οὐ γὰρ τὸ κατα-
5 σκευάζον, ἀλλὰ τὸ κατασκευαζόμενον χαρακτηρίζει τὸ εἶδος. σκοπήσωμεν τοίνυν, τί τὸ ἴδιον τοῦ ἐγκωμίου καθέστηκεν. ἔστι τοίνυν ὁμολογουμένων ἀγαθῶν λόγος αὐξητικός. ὅπερ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐνταῦθα. οὐδὲ γὰρ ὡς ὁμολογουμένων ἀγαθῶν ποιεῖται τὴν αὔξησιν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς λύσιν τῶν δοκούντων ἐγκλημάτων, ὧν αὐτοῖς ὁ Πλάτων ἀπέδωκεν, ὁ Ἀριστείδης εἴληφε
6 τὰ ἐγκώμια. ὅπερ, ὡς ἔφαμεν, καὶ ὁ ῥήτωρ ἐν τῶι Περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου πεποίηκε. κἀκεῖ μὲν γὰρ ὁ Δημοσθένης πολλάκις ἑαυτὸν ἐνεκωμίασεν· οὐ μὴν διὰ τοῦτο ὁ λόγος ἐγκώμιον, ἀλλὰ δηλονότι πρὸς τὴν κατηγορίαν

1 καὶ ἐγκώμια **A L M P V b l** : ἐγκώμια **p r v**
εἶδος **O** : ἦθος **V**
2 ‹ἂν› *Lenz* : *om.* **O**
τοῦ **A M P V p r v** : *om.* **L b l**
λόγον *post* λεπτίνην *hab.* **L P b**
ἢ τὸν **V b p r** : ἢ **L** : καὶ τὸν **M** : *om.* **A P l v**
4 προάγεται **O** : ἄγεται **L**
ἡ *om.* **P**
5 σκοπήσωμεν **O** : σκοπήσομεν **V l**
6 τί τὸ ἴδιον (*om.* τοῦ) ἐγκωμιαστικοῦ (ου *supra*; αστικοῦ *lin. del.*) καθέστηκεν. ἔστι τοίνυν *i. m. add.* **P**
τὸ *om.* **M**
ἔτι **V**; *cf. Schol. III 286, 12 sqq. et Pan. p. 122, 12 sq.*
7 ὡς **O** : *om.* **L P**
8 τὴν **A M V l p r v** : *om.* **L P b** *sed post* ποιεῖται *hab.* :/ **P**
9 αὐτοῖς **A L M P V b l** : *post* πλάτων *pos.* **v** : αὐτοῖς (ὅς *supra*) **r** : αὐτὸς **p**
ἀπέδωκεν **A M l v** : ἀπήνεγκεν **b** : ἐπήνεγκεν **L P V p** : ἐπήνεγκεν (ε ὧν *supra*) **r**; *cf. p. 160, 8*
10 ὡς ἔφαμεν *om.* **M**
τοῦ **A M P v** *et sup. lin.* **b**[1] : *om.* **L V b l p r**
11 κἀκεῖ **O** : καὶ εἰ **P**
κἀκεῖ μὲν γὰρ ὁ δημοσθένης *om.* **M**
ἐνεκωμίασεν **v** : ἐνεγκωμίασεν **A V** : ἐγκωμίασεν **l p r** : ἐγκωμιάζει **L P b** : ἐγκωμιάσας **M**
12 δηλονότι **O** : *om.* **M**
12 sqq. πρὸς τὴν κατηγορίαν (γορίαν **V**) αἰσχίνου καὶ ὧν κατηγόρησε (κατηγόρησε, α *supra*, **L** *qui quid sibi voluerit nescio*) **A L V l p r v** : πρὸς τὴν κατηγορίαν αἰσχίνου **P b** : πρὸς ἃ κατηγόρησεν αἰσχίνης **M**; *quamquam possis suspicari hic extare reliquias duplicis lectionis* καὶ *coniunctionis auxilio insertae, tamen verisimilius est* **M** *ut aliis locis ita hic quoque exhibere textum contractum*

Αἰσχίνου καὶ ὧν κατηγόρησε τοὺς ἐπαίνους προσείληφεν. ὅταν μὲν γὰρ αὐθαίρετον καὶ προηγούμενον ἔχωμεν τὸν ἔπαινον, ἀλλʼ οὐκ ἐξ ἀνάγκης τινὸς γιγνόμενον, ἐγκωμιαστικὴν ποιεῖται τὴν ὑπόθεσιν. νῦν δὲ ἐξ
437 D. ἀνάγκης πρὸς τὴν φι/λοσόφου κατηγορίαν ἐνιστάμενος πρὸς λύσιν εἴληφε τῶν ἀνδρῶν τὰ ἐγκώμια.

οὐ μὴν τοῦ δικανικοῦ εἴδους δύναται εἶναι ὁ λόγος· οὐδὲ γὰρ τούτου πάλιν φυλάττει τὸ ἴδιον· ἴδιον γὰρ τοῦ δικανικοῦ τὸ ἔχειν ἐγκλήματα καὶ τούτων ἀπολογίαν. ἐνταῦθα δὲ οὐ φύσει ὁ Πλάτων τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐπήνεγκεν ἐκλήματα, ἀλλὰ κολακείαν αὐτῶν κατηγόρησεν καὶ ἅπερ ἐν τῶι Περικλεῖ διαβέβληκεν. λάλους γάρ, φησι, καὶ δειλοὺς καὶ φιλαργύρους εἰργάσατο· ἅπερ δηλονότι οὐδʼ αὐτὰ ἐγκλήματα φύσει καθέστηκεν. κολακεία γὰρ μισεῖται μέν, ἀλλʼ οὐκ ἤδη καὶ κολάζεται· τὰ γὰρ ἐγκλήματα δηλονότι

6 ὅτι οὐδὲ τοῦ δικανικοῦ εἴδους ὁ λόγος ἐστίν *i. m.* **p**

1 προσείληφεν **O** : προείληφεν **P** : παρείληφεν **V**
2 καὶ προηγούμενον *om.* **M**
ἔχομεν **V**
2-3 καὶ προηγούμενον - νῦν δὲ *om.* **l**
τὸν ἔπαινον *hic om. et pos. post* ἀνάγκης *ubi* τινὸς γιγνόμενον *om. et pergit* ἐγκωμιαστικὴ ἡ ὑπόθεσις. νῦν δὲ **M**
3 γιγνόμενον **A L V l r v** : γινόμενον **P b p**
ποιεῖται **A V l p r v** : ποιούμεθα **L P b** ; ποιεῖται *sc.* ὁ ῥήτωρ
3-4 νῦν δὲ ἐξ ἀνάγκης **A L M V b r v** : νῦν ἐξ ἀνάγκης **P** : ἐξ ἀνάγκης δὲ νῦν **p** : νῦν δὲ *om.* (*cf. supra*) *et* ἐξ ἀνάγκης *pos. post* κατηγορίαν **l**
4 φιλοσόφου **A L M P b l v** : τοῦ φιλοσόφου **V p r**
ἐνιστάμενος **O** : ἐνστησάμενος **V**
6 οὐ μὴν **A M P b l v** : οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ **V p r** : ἀλλʼ οὐδὲ μὴν **L**
δύναται εἶναι **O** : ἐστὶν **l**; *cf. Te. 141, 5 sq. et imprimis 144, 6 sq.*
ante οὐδὲ γὰρ τούτου *add.* οὐ γὰρ δύναται **l**
6-7 οὐδὲ - τὸ ἴδιον *om.* **M**
7 πάλιν *om.* **L**
τὸ (*ssc.* ἀ) ἴδιον (*ssc.* α) **r**, ἴδιονʼ ἴδιον γὰρ *incip. f.* 3ʳ **R**
8 οὐ φύσει *eqs.*: *cf. Te.* (*p. 146, 9 sq.*)
8-9 ἐπήνεγκεν ἐγκλήματα **O** : ἐπήνεγκεν τὰ ἐγκλήματα **l** : ἐπήνεγκε τὰ ἐγκλήματα **M**
9 αὐτῶν **A M R V v** : αὐτὴν **L P b l p**
κατηγόρησεν **V** : κατηγόρησε **A M P R b l p v** : κατηγόρηκε **L**
ἅπερ **O** : ὥσπερ **M**
10 διαβέβληκεν **R** : διαβέβληκε **O**
λάλους **P**, *lin. ind. et i. m. adscr.* λάλους **P**[2]
φησι: *Gorg. 515 e, cf. Te.* (*144, 11 sq.*)
δειλοὺς **O** : δηλοὺς **V**
11 δῆλονότι **O** : *om.* **M**
καθέστηκεν **R V** : καθέστηκε **O**
12 καὶ **A M R V b p v** : *om.* **L P l** γὰρ] δὲ **M**
12-p. 161, 1 τὰ γὰρ - κολάζεται *om.* **V l p**, *add. i. m.* **p**[1]: τὰ γὰρ - οὐ *om.* **L P b**: δηλονότι 11 νόμοις *om.* **M**

καὶ τοῖς νόμοις κολάζεται. οὐ τοίνυν οὐδὲ τοῦ δικανικοῦ εἴδους δύναται εἶναι ὁ λόγος.

8 λείπεται τοίνυν εἶδος μὴ ἔχειν τὸν λόγον. τοιγάρτοι τῶν σοφῶν τις Ἀθήνησιν ἀπορήσας καὶ ἀποδείξας, ὡς οὐδετέρου τῶν εἰδῶν δύναται εἶναι ὁ λόγος, ἀνασκευὴν αὐτὸν ἀπεφήνατο· ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἓν τῶν προγυμνασμάτων. καὶ πῶς οὐκ ἀτοπώτατον τοσαύτην ὑπόθεσιν ὑποβάλλειν τοῖς προγυμνάσμασιν; ὡμολόγηται γάρ, ὡς πολὺ τῆς ὑποθέσεως διενήνοχε τὰ προγυμνάσματα· ἡ μὲν γὰρ τελεία [ὑπόθεσις], τὰ δὲ μέρη τῆς ὑποθέσεως καὶ ἀμφισβήτησιν ἐπιδέχεται, οὐδὲ μὴν ἔχει περίστασιν· ἦ γὰρ ἂν οὐδὲν
9 διέφερε τῶν προγυμνασμάτων ἡ ὑπόθεσις. τί οὖν ἄρα καὶ τὸ εἶδος λεκτέον τοῦ λόγου; ἀλλὰ τοῖς κατανοεῖν δυναμένοις τέχνας τοῦτο δεδήλωκεν ἡμῖν ἐν τοῖς Προγυμνάσμασιν ἐν τῶι τέλει τῆς τέχνης Θέων ὁ τεχνογράφος

4 ὅτι τινὲς ἀπορήσαντες ἀνασκευὴν εἶναι τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀπολογίαν ὡρίσαντο, ὅπερ οὐκ ἔστιν *i.m.* **p**

1 οὐ τοίνυν **O** : ἀλλ' **M**
2 εἶναι ὁ λόγος **A L R V p v** : ὁ λόγος εἶναι **M P b** : ὁ λόγος **l**
3 λείπεται *an* λέγεται? **p**
μὴ : ἡ *ex corr.* **P**
τοιγάρτοι **M** : καὶ γάρτοι **O** : καὶ γὰρ **p**
3-4 τῶν σοφῶν τις ἀθήνησιν **O** : τῶν σοφῶν τις **M** : τις τῶν σοφῶν // ἀθήνησιν **p**
4-5 καὶ ἀποδείξας - λόγος *om.* **M**, *cf. quae dixi ad p. 159, 12 sq.*
4 οὐδετέρου *Lenz* : οὐδέτερον **O** : οὐδέτερα **p**, *cf. p. 158, 15. 160, 6. 161, 1. 171, 19 sq.*
5 ἀνασκευήν: *cf. Schol. III 456, 23 Te. 48 (149, 6 sqq.) Lenz Unters. 21*
7 ὡμολόγηται γὰρ ὡς *om. sic pergit* πολὺ γὰρ τῆς ὑποθέσεως ταῦτα διενήνοχεν **M** : ὡμολόγηται μὲν γὰρ **V**
καὶ
ὡς **R** α
8 τελεία [ὑπόθεσις] *Lenz* : τελεία (τέλει **P**) ὑπόθεσις **O** : ὑπόθεσις τελεία *Rabe* : *possis etiam conicere* ἡ μὲν γὰρ τελεία, <ἡ> ὑπόθεσις, *sed malo* ὑπόθεσις *ut explicationem uncis includere ita ut habeas* ἡ μὲν γάρ·, τὰ δέ·
9 καὶ ἀμφισβήτησιν ἐπιδέχεται *om.* **M**
////
οὐδὲ *Lenz* : οὔτε **O** : ὀυ **R**
10 καὶ **O** : *om.* **M v**
10-11 λεκτέον τοῦ λόγου **O** : τοῦ λόγου λεκτέον **M**
11 ἀλλὰ **O** : τοῦτο οὖν *sed* τοῦτο *ante* δεδήλωκεν *om.* **M**
τέχνας **A L P b l v** : τὰς τέχνας **R V p** : *om.* **M**
12 ἡμῖν **A P R V l p v** : *om.* **L M b**
ἐν τοῖς προγυμνάσμασιν **O** : *om.* **M**; *possis suspicari verba* ἐν τοῖς προγυμνάσμασι *et* ἐν τῶι τέλει τῆς τέχνης *duplicem lectionem esse*; *sed iterum iterumque timeo ne* **M** *textum exhibeat contractum*
12-p. 162, 1 ὁ τεχνογράφος εἰπὼν **O** : εἰπὼν ὁ τεχνογράφος **p**; ὁ τεχνογράφος *verba fort. glossa*; *de Theone et Sopatro cf. Ioann. Siceliot. VI 456, 1 sqq. Walz* καὶ οὐ προσεκτέον Θέωνι καὶ Σωπάτρωι παρὰ τὴν κοινὴν δόξαν καὶ Πλάτωνος καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους τέταρτον εἶδος τῆς ῥητορικῆς τιθεμένοις, *cf. 455, 29 sqq.*

εἰπών· «ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἕτερον εἶδος ἀντίρρησις, ὅπερ οὐκέτι μὲν τυγχάνει προγύμνασμα, μερικὸν δὲ εἶδος ῥητορικῆς, ὅπερ τῶν μὲν γενικωτάτων εἰδῶν οὐκ ἔστι, τέλειόν γε μὴν εἶδος ἢ καὶ μέρος καθέστηκεν. καὶ τοῦτο καὶ ἐκ πολλῶν ἄλλων μερικῶν εἰδῶν ἐστι καταμαθεῖν, † εἴτε λεκτέον [εἴτε] βασιλικὸν εἴτε ἐπιθαλάμιον εἴτε ἐπιτάφιον καὶ ἄλλα πολλά, ὧν ἕκαστον τυγχάνει τῆς ἐγκωμιαστικῆς ἰδέας». καὶ ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τοῦ εἴδους.

10 ἐκεῖνο δὲ παρατηρητέον, ὅτι Πλάτων οὐκ εὐθὺς οὐδὲ ἐκ προοιμίων ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν κατηγορίαν τῶν ἀνδρῶν, ἀλλ' ὑπέθετο πρῶτον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ ψυχῆς ὄντα καὶ σώματος. δύο δὲ ταύτας περὶ αὐτὸν εἶναι παρασκευὰς καὶ τὴν μὲν ἀρίστην, ἥτις παρασκευάζει ἄριστον εἶναι τὸν

1 ὅτι ἀντιρρητικοῦ εἴδους ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος κατὰ τὸν τεχνογράφον Θέωνα *i. m.* **p**

7 ὅτι οὐ προηγουμένως οὐδ' εὐθὺς καὶ ἐκ προοιμίων Πλάτων ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν κατηγορίαν τῶν ἀνδρῶν, ἀλλ' ἐξ ὑποθέσεως τῆς κατὰ διαίρεσιν ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος *i. m.* **p**

1 δὲ **O** : *om.* **M**
οὐκέτι μὲν τυγχάνει **O** : οὐκ ἔστι **M**
2 μὲν **O** : *om.* **M**
3 γε μὴν **O** : δὲ **M**
ἢ καὶ **O** : ἢ **M** : καὶ **R**
καθέστηκεν **V** *Paris.* *2952* : καθέστηκε **O**
4 ἐκ **O** : ἐπὶ *Rabe*
ἄλλων **O** : *om.* **p**
μερικῶν εἰδῶν ἐστι καταμαθεῖν **O** : εἰδῶν μερικῶν ἐστι καταμαθεῖν **R** : μερικῶν ἐστιν εἰδῶν καταμαθεῖν **p**
4-5 εἴτε λεκτέον - πολλὰ *sic* **A v**: εἴτε /// τέον (*i. ras.*) εἴτε βασιλικὸν εἴτε (ει *ex corr.*) — πολλὰ **p** : εἴτε βασιλικὸν λεκτέον εἴτε — πολλὰ **L P b** : εἴτε λεκτέον *non hab. sed post* καταμαθεῖν *lacunam reliquit, tum pergit* εἴτε βασικὸν-πολλὰ **l** : εἴ τι (ἤ τί **V**) λεκτέον εἴτε βασιλικὸν—πολλὰ **R V** : βασιλικῶν ἐπιθαλαμίων ἐπιταφίων : *sic post* καταμαθεῖν, *nihil amplius* **M**, *pro* λεκτέον *ci.* γενεθλιακὸν *et post* ἐπιτάφιον *crucem pos. Rabe* : *aut lacuna sive ante sive post* λεκτέον *statuenda videtur aut fort.* εἴτε *ante* βασιλικὸν *delend. aut verba* εἴτε λεκτέον *in quibus plurimi librarii offenderunt ita transponenda sunt ut collocentur ante* καὶ ἄλλα πολλά
6 ἕκαστον **M V l v** *et sic ci. Rabe* : ἕκαστα **A L P R b p**
καὶ ταῦτα **O** : ταῦτα **M P** *sed cf. Te. p. 149, 12*
περὶ **M** : καὶ περὶ **O** : καὶ **P**, *cf. p. 158, 13*
7 ἐκεῖνο δὲ παρατηρητέον **O** : παρατηρητέον δὲ **M**
πλάτων **O** : ὁ πλάτων **A**
8 πρῶτον: *Gorg. 464 a*
9-10 ταύτας περὶ (περὶ *om.* **R**, *sup. lin. add. m. rec.*) αὐτὸν εἶναι παρασκευὰς **A L P R b l v** : ταύτας περὶ αὐτὸν εἶναι τὰς παρασκευὰς **V p** : παρασκευὰς περὶ αὐτὸν εἶναι **M**
10 καὶ τὴν μὲν **O** : τὴν μὲν **M**
comma pos. post ἀρίστην *Lenz, post* παρασκευάζει *Dind.*

438 D. ἄνθρωπον, τὴν δὲ μιμεῖσθαι τὴν ἀρίστην πα/ρασκευήν. καὶ μερίζει πρῶτον τὴν ἀρίστην παρασκευὴν εἰς μέρη δ̄ καὶ δίδωσι δύο μὲν τῆι ψυχῆι, δύο δὲ τῶι σώματι. καὶ τοῦ μὲν σώματος θεραπείαν λέγει τήν τε γυμναστικὴν καὶ τὴν ἰατρικήν. ἡ μὲν γὰρ ὅλως, φησίν, οὐ συγχωρεῖ νοσεῖν τὴν ἀρχήν, ἡ γυμναστική, ἡ δὲ ἰατρικὴ τὸν νοσοῦντα θεραπεύει. καὶ ἀμφοτέρας μὲν ἐπαινεῖ τὰς παρασκευάς, ἐπὶ πλέον δὲ τὴν γυμναστικὴν τῆς ἰατρικῆς· φησὶ
11 γὰρ μὴ νοσεῖν ὅλως ἀρχὴν βέλτιον ἢ νοσοῦντα θεραπεύεσθαι. ὁμοίως πάλιν καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς δύο μέρη δίδωσι, τὴν νομοθετικὴν καὶ τὴν δικαστικήν. ἡ μὲν γάρ, φησί, διδάσκει τά τε δίκαια καὶ τὰ καλὰ καὶ τὰ

ἥτις *sup. lin.* **A**
10 sq. ἥτις - ἄνθρωπον *om.* **M**

1 παρασκευὴν **O** : *om.* **M**
2 μέρη **O** : *om.* **p**
δ̄ **M R V p** : τέσσαρα **A L P b l v**
δύο μὲν **O** : μὲν δύο **V**
3 καὶ τοῦτο μὲν *Paris. 2952*
λέγει **O** : λέγω **p**
4 ὅλως φησὶν *om.* **M** : φησὶν *om.* **V** *Paris. 2952*
τὴν ἀρχὴν *pos. ante* οὐ **L P b** *et scr.* φησὶ **P**
4-5 τὴν ἀρχὴν ἡ γυμναστικὴ *om.* **M**
5 τὸν νοσοῦντα **A L M P b l v** : τὸ νοσοῦν *non male* **R V p**
μὲν **O** : *om.* **M**
6 τὰς παρασκευὰς **O** : *om.* **M**
ἐπὶ **O** : ἔτι **l** : *om.* **M**
γυμναστικὴν *add. in spatio a librario relicto vacuo m. schol.* **M**
τῆς ἰατρικῆς **A R V l p v** : *om.* **L M P b**
6-7 φησὶ γὰρ **A L P R V b l v** : δέον γάρ φησι **M** : τὸ *sed i. m. ante* τὸ *add.* κρεῖττον γὰρ **p**
7 ἀρχὴν **A R V l p** : τὴν ἀρχὴν **L P b v** *et* τὴν *sup. lin. m. rec.* **R** *et sup. lin.* **p** : ὅλως ἀρχὴν βέλτιον *om.* **M**
post ἀρχὴν *add.* βέλτιον **v**, *id quod speciminis gratia recepi, lacunosa enim verba esse per se patet*: βέλτιον *deest* **O**
ἢ νοσοῦντα θεραπεύεσθαι **A L M R V l v** : ἢ νοσοῦντας θεραπεύεσθαι **p** : *om.* **P b**
post ὁμοίως *sup. lin. add. sed postea del.* καὶ **v**
8 πάλιν *om. et* δίδωσι *add.* **M**, *cf. vers. 8*
ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς **O** : τῇ ψυχῇ **M**
δύο μέρη **O** : μέρη δύο **M**
δίδωσι **O** : *post* ὁμοίως *pos.* **M** *qui fort. vers. 2* secu*tus est*: *pro* δίδωσι *mavoult* τίθησι *Lenz*
τὴν **O** : τήν τε **M**; *diiudicari non potest uter recte, cf. vers. 3 et p. 165, 2 cum p. 164, 6*
9 δικαστικὴν **O** : διδακτικὴν **p**
τε **O** : *om.* **M**
καὶ τὰ καλὰ *om.* m[1], *sup. lin. add. m. schol.* **M**
τὰ *tert. sup. lin. add.* **l**

συμφέροντα, ἡ δὲ τοὺς ταῦτα παραβαίνοντας κολάζει καὶ βελτίους ἀπεργάζεται. καὶ γίνεται, φησίν, ἰατρικὴ πονηρίας ἡ δίκη. ταύτην, φησί, τὴν ἀρίστην παρασκευὴν ὑποδύεται κολακεία τις μιμουμένη τὴν ἀρίστην παρασκευήν, ἀγεννὴς οὖσα. καὶ μερίζει, φησί, καὶ αὐτὴ ἑαυτὴν εἰς δ̅, δύο μὲν περὶ τὸ σῶμα, δύο δὲ ὁμοίως περὶ τὴν ψυχήν. καὶ τοῦ σώματος εἶναι τήν τε κομμωτικήν, λέγων τὴν κοσμητικήν, τουτέστι τὴν κουρικὴν καὶ τὴν ὑφαντικήν· καλλωπίζουσι γὰρ αὗται, φησι, τὸ σῶμα. εἶτα τὴν μαγειρικήν, ἥτις, φησί, προσποιεῖται τὸ σῶμα παρασκευάζειν φαίνεσθαι

1 τοὺς **L M P b p v** *et sup. lin. m. rec.* **R** : *om.* **A R V l**
1-2 ἀπεργάζεται **O** : ἐργάζεται **M**
2 γίνεται **M P V b p** *et* **R** *in quo verba* γίνεται φησὶν *quae legi non iam poterant iterata sunt a m. rec.*: γίγνεται **A L V l**
ἰατρικὴ **L M V l p v** : ἡ ἰατρικὴ **A P R b**
φησὶ **O** : φησὶν **l** : *om.* **M**
3 *post* παρασκευὴν *pergit* 4 γένος οὖσα, *tum sup. lin. signum lacunae pos. et in inf. pag. add.* ὑποδύεται - οὖσα **A** : *post* παρασκευὴν *pergit* γένος οὖσα ὑποδύεται - παρασκευήν, *tum* γένος οὖσα *om. sed statim pergit* καὶ μερίζει **v** : *post* παρασκευὴν *pergit* γένος οὖσαν ὑποδύεται κολακεία τις καὶ μερίζει **L** : *post* παρασκευὴν *add.* γένος οὖσαν **P b**
3-4 ὑποδύεται - παρασκευὴν *om.* **l** : μιμουμένη - παρασκευὴν *om.* **M** : μιμουμένη - οὖσα *om.* **P b**
4 ἀγεννὴς οὖσα *coll. Gorg. 465 b 3 Lenz* : γένους οὖσα(ν) **O**
post γένος οὖσα *add.* καὶ αὐτή· **M**, *cf.* καὶ *in eod. vers.*
οὖσαν **l**
φησὶ καὶ αὐτὴ ἑαυτὴν **A V l p v** : καὶ αὐτὴν (*sed novit etiam* καὶ αὐτή, *cf. paulo supra*) **M** : φησὶν αὐτὴ ἑαυτὴν **L P R b**
δ̅ **L M R V b l p** : τέσσαρα **A P v**
5 ὁμοίως **O** : *om.* **M**
τὴν **O** : *om.* **P**
τοῦ σώματος **O** : τοῦ μὲν σώματος **b v** (*ex p. 163, 3 pnto*)
6-7 τε - εἶτα: *Andoc. I 58* ἐπαινέσοντάς τε ὑμᾶς, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ συνησθησομένους
6 τήν γε **V** λέγων: *subaudiendum est ex 4* φησὶ
τὴν κοσμητικὴν **O** : *om. a librario i. m. versui priori adscr. m. schol.* **M** : τὴν κοσμικὴν **b**
κουρικήν: *non apud Plat., hac voce utitur Dio Prus. VII 117*
7 καλλωπίζουσι **O** : καλλωπίζουσαι **V l**
φησι **O** : *om.* **M V** *Paris. 2952*
εἶτα **O** : καὶ **M**
8-p. 165, 1 ἥτις - γυμναστικῆι *om.* **M**
8 φησι *hic om. pos. post* σῶμα **V**
παρασκευάζειν **O** : παρασκευάζουσα **l**

12 καλόν, οὐκ ὂν δὲ τῆι ἀληθείαι ὥσπερ ἐν τῆι γυμναστικῆι. τῆς δὲ πάλιν ψυχῆς φησι τήν τε σοφιστικὴν καὶ τὴν ῥητορικήν. καὶ τὴν μὲν σοφιστικὴν μιμεῖσθαι τὴν νομοθετικήν — καὶ αὐτὴ γάρ, φησι, προσποιεῖται εἰδέναι τὰ καλὰ καὶ τὰ δίκαια, οὐκ οἶδεν δὲ ἀληθῶς — τὴν δὲ ῥητορικὴν μιμεῖσθαι τὴν δικαστικήν· γίγνεται γάρ, φησιν, ὁ ῥήτωρ τῆς σοφιστικῆς διάκονος καὶ ὑπηρέτης ὥσπερ ὁ δικαστὴς τοῦ νομοθέτου. καὶ οὕτω τεταρτημόριον κολακείας γίνεται ἡ ῥητορική, ἐπειδὴ καὶ δ̄ μέρη λέγει εἶναι τῆς κολακείας. τούτωι τῶι τρόπωι, τουτέστι προσχήματι τῆς παρασκευῆς, ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν κατηγορίαν τῆς ῥητορικῆς καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν [δηλονότι τὴν διαβολήν].

13 ὁ δὲ ῥήτωρ τὸν λόγον ἐμέρισεν εἰς δύο, εἴς τε πρόσωπον καὶ πρᾶγμα. καὶ εἰς μὲν τὸ πρόσωπον πεποίηκε τὰ ἐγκώμια, εἰς δὲ τὸ πρᾶγμα τοὺς ἀγῶνας. γνωστέον δέ, ὡς οὐδέτερον ἀλλήλων κεχώρισται, οὔτε τὰ

1 ὄν: ἂν *apud Dind. vid. error typoth.*
1-2 πάλιν ψυχῆς **O** : ψυχῆς πάλιν **M p**
2 φησι **A R V l p v** : φησιν εἶναι **L P b** : *om. sed post* πάλιν *add.* β̄ **M**; *vid. nulla iusta causa repetere ex p. 164, 4 sq.*
τήν τε **O** : τὴν **P b**
3 αὐτὴ **O** : αὕτη **R b**
προσποιεῖται: προς *ante versum add.* **l**
4 οἶδεν **R** : οἶδε **O**
ἀληθῶς **O** : τὸ ἀληθὲς **V** *Paris. 2952*
τὴν δὲ **O** : τὴν **P**
5 γίγνεται **O** : γίνεται **P p**
φησὶν *om. Paris. 2952*
τῆς σοφιστικῆς **O** : τῆς πολιτικῆς *Paris. 2952*
6 ὁ **O** : *om.* **P**
6-7 τετ(ττ **l**)αρτημόριον **O** : τεταρτομόριον **P**
7 γίνεται **L M P R V l p** : γίγνεται **A b v**
καὶ **O** : δὲ **p**
δ̄ **M R b l** : τέσσαρα **A L P V p v**
λέγει εἶναι **A L R V b l v** : εἶναι λέγει **P p** : *om.* **M**
8 τούτω τῶ προσχήματι (*om.* τρόπω τουτέστι) **M**
προσχήματι **O** : τῶ προσχήματι (**M**) **p** *et* **R** *in quo* τῶ *sup. lin. add. m. rec.*
9-10 καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν (*om.* δηλονότι τὴν διαβολήν) **M**, *ut explicat. uncis seclus. Lenz* : καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν δηλονότι τὴν διαβολὴν **p** *et m. rec.* **R** : καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν δηλονότι τῆς διαβολῆς **A L R V l v** : καὶ τὴν διαβολὴν τῶν ἀνδρῶν **P b** *et* γρ. *praefixo ssc.* **L**
12 τὰ ἐγκώμια τῶν ἀγώνων **V** *Paris. 2952, cf p. 166, 1*
τὸ πρᾶγμα **O** : πρᾶγμα **p**
13 γνωστέον **O** : ἰστέον **v**
οὐδέτερον **O** : οὐδέτερα *Paris. 2952*
κεχάρισται **V**

ἐγκώμια τῶν ἀγώνων, τουτέστι τῆς ἀπολογίας τῶν δοκούντων ἐγκλη-
439 D. μάτων, οὔτε / πάλιν οἱ ἀγῶνες τῶν ἐγκωμίων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ πλεονάζοντος εἴληφεν ἑκάτερον τὸ νόημα. ἐν μὲν γὰρ τοῖς ἐγκωμίοις ἐλάττονα τὰ
14 ἐγκλήματα καὶ τούτων ἡ λύσις, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀγῶσιν ὁμοίως ἐλάττονα τὰ ἐγκώμια, ἐπειδὴ μία ἑκατέρων τῶν εἰδῶν ἡ ὑπόθεσις, ἀλλὰ τεχνικῶς δηλονότι ὁ ῥήτωρ προέταξε τοῦ προσώπου τὰ ἐγκώμια, ἵνα συστήσας διὰ τούτων τὸ πρόσωπον ἀνέλῃ τῶν δοκούντων ἐγκλημάτων τὴν διαβολήν.

2 πάλιν **O** : *om.* **M**
post πλεονάζοντος *add.* ἤδη **V**
3 ἑκάτερον **O** : ἑκατέρων **P**
νόημα *Dindorfii* **B** : ὄνομα **O** (*iteravit m. rec., sed etiam librarius ipse vid. scr.* ὄνομα **R**)
τοῖς ἐγκωμίοις *ex corr.* **p**
ἔλαττον **p**
5 ἡ *om.* **P**
τεχνικὸς **V**
6 δηλονότι *om.* **M**
τοῦ προσώπου **O** : τῶν προσώπων **v**, *sed cf.* 7
7 διαβολήν **O** : δύναμιν **l** *Vat.* 934; *existimaverim auctorem vocem* διαβολήν, *non* δύναμιν, *consulto in fine totius argumenti collocavisse*

THE HYPOTHESIS H_2

quae est apud Dindorfium III 433 sqq. H_1

CODICES

A = Paris. Bibl. Nat. graec. 2951

A[c] = corrector codicis **A**

K = Vat. graec. 74

L = Laur. 60, 6

Q = Vat. graec. 1297

R = Vat. graec. 1298

T = Laur. 60, 8

V = Marc. graec. App. VIII 7

a = Ambr. A. 175 sup.

v = Vat. graec. 75 (commemoratione non dignus nisi cum dissentit ab **A**)

sine ulla fere auctoritate Paris. graec. 2952. 2953 Vat. graec. 933

433 D.

ʽΥΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ ΤΟΥ ʽΥΠΕΡ ΤΩΝ ΤΕΣΣΑΡΩΝ

1 Πλάτων ὁ ᾽Αρίστωνος, ἐπισημότατος ἐν φιλοσοφίαι γενόμενος, τὴν
ἑαυτοῦ τέχνην εἰς μέγεθος ἆραι βουλόμενος τοὺς νέους προτρέπεται, τῆι
ῥητορικῆι λοιδορούμενος. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ὁ τῶν ῥητόρων βίος, ὥσπερ εἰκός,
ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν ὡς δυνατὸς ἐθαυμάζετο, συνέγραψέν τινα διάλογον
Γοργίαν οὕτω καλούμενον, ἐν ὧι διαβάλλει τὸν τῶν ῥητόρων καὶ τὸν τῶν
2 τυράννων βίον ὡς φαῦλον ὄντα καὶ ἄδικον. καὶ πρῶτον μὲν αὐτὴν τὴν
τέχνην, φημὶ δὴ τὴν ῥητορικήν, ἔπειτα δὲ αὐτοὺς διαβάλλει τοὺς ῥήτορας
ἐν παραδείγματος μέρει τὴν κατηγορίαν ποιούμενος, καὶ τοὺς ἐπισήμους
ἐν αὐτῆι δοκοῦντας εἶναι τῆι τέχνηι, τούτους ἐκκρίνας κωμωιδεῖ μᾶλλον
ἢ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀντέχεται, φημὶ δὴ Θεμιστοκλέα τὸν ῥήτορα καὶ Μιλτιάδην
καὶ Περικλέα τὸν πάνυ καὶ Κίμωνα. καὶ μέρει τινὶ τὴν κατὰ πάντων
ἐκφέρεται ψῆφον, ἐκ τῶν ἐπιφανῶν τὴν κρίσιν ποιούμενος, εὖ εἰδώς, ὡς ἡ
πρὸς τούτους οὖσα φαυλότης καὶ αὐτῆς ὡς εἰπεῖν τῆς ῥητορείας καθ-
3 άπτεται. πρὸς ταύτην τοίνυν τὴν λοιδορίαν — οὐ γὰρ κατηγορίαν
ὀνομάσαι σεμνόν — ᾽Αριστείδης ὁ θεῖος γενόμενος, βοηθῶν ἅμα κινδυ-

1 ὑπόθεσις τοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν τεσσάρων **A R** : ἡ ὑπόθεσις τοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν τεσσάρων (δ̅ **V**) **Q V** : ἡ ὑπόθεσις τῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν τεσσάρων **T** : προλεγόμενα τῶν ὑπὲρ τῶν τεσσάρων **K**
2 πλάτων: ν *i. ras. 3 litt.* A^c
ὁ ἀρίστωνος **O** : ὁ τοῦ ἀρίστωνος **L**
2-4 τὴν - λοιδορούμενος *om.* **K** *Vat. 933*
3 *post* προτρέπεται *add.* εἰς φιλοσοφίαν **L Q T a**
4 ἐπειδήπερ *sed i. m.* γρ. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ **a**
γὰρ *om. propter 2-4 omissos* **K**
τῶν ῥητόρων **O** : τῶν τυράννων **L** : τῶν ῥτητόρων καὶ τῶν τυράννων **K**, *cf. 6-7*
5 ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν **O** : *deest apud Dind.*
συνέγραψεν **A V** : συνέγραψε **O**
6-7 τὸν τῶν ῥητόρων καὶ τὸν (τ̅, *i.e.* τῶν *corr. in* τὸν **V**) τῶν τυράννων βίον **O** : τῶν ῥητόρων καὶ τῶν τυράννων τὸν βίον *Dindorfii* **A**
7 πρῶτον **A L Q T** : πρῶτ$\overset{\alpha}{o}$ν **a** : πρῶτα **K** : πρώτην **R V**
τὴν *om. post* αὐτὴν **A R V**, *sup. lin. add.* A^c
post αὐτὴν *add.* διασύρει **L Q T a** (*cf. ad 3*)
8 δὲ **O** : *om.* **K** *Vat. 933 Paris. 2953 quibus fides habenda non est*
9 *post* κατηγορίαν *desin. hypoth., inc.* Κίμων (*II 202, 27 D.*) **V**
post ποιούμενος *add.* οὐ γὰρ (οὐδὲ γὰρ **L**) προηγουμένως οὐδ᾽ ἐξ ἀρχῆς τοῦτο προθέμενος (*ex p. 157, 9*), *tum pergunt* ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς **L Q T a** *Paris. 2952*
11 δὴ **O** : δὲ *Paris. 2952*
τὸν τύραννον **L**
14 ῥητορείας **O** : ῥητορικῆς *cum* **A** *suo(?) Dind.*
16 ὀνομάσαι σεμνὸν **O** : ὀνομάσαιμι (*sine* ἂν) **K**
ὁ θεῖος γενόμενος **A K R** : *om.* **L Q T a**

νευούσηι τῆι τέχνηι καὶ περὶ πλείστου τὴν τῶν ῥητόρων συμμορίαν ποιούμενος, ἀνθίσταται τοῖς λόγοις ὡς ὅπλοις χρησάμενος, οὐ τῆι ῥητορείαι μᾶλλον ὅσον τῶι βίωι συμμαχῆσαι βουλόμενος. καὶ δύο μὲν λόγοις
434 D. τὴν περὶ τῆς τέχνης ἀπολογίαν πεποίηται, ἐν / οἷς οὐ τέχνην μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ κρείττον' ἢ τέχνην οὖσαν αὐτὴν ἀποδείκνυσιν. περιουσίαι δὲ λόγων ἐπὶ τὸ τῶν ῥητόρων ἐνταῦθα μεταβαίνει κεφάλαιον, καὶ τούτοις ὥσπερ χρέος τὴν γενομένην ἀπονέμων βοήθειαν. καὶ ἡ μὲν ὑπόθεσις αὕτη.

4 τὸ δὲ εἶδος τοῦ λόγου πολλὴν ἔχει τὴν ζήτησιν, ποίου γε ἄρα τῆς ῥητορικῆς καθέστηκεν εἴδους. ὅτι μὲν οὖν οὐδεμίαν ἔχει τῆι συμβουλῆι κοινωνίαν ὁ λόγος, δεδήλωται. λείπεται τοίνυν ἑνὸς τῶν ἑτέρων εἶναι τὸν λόγον εἰδῶν· ὡς εἴ γε ἄρα κεχωρίσθαι τούτων ἀμφοτέρων συμβήσεται, κινδυνεύειν ἀνάγκη τῆς ῥητορικῆς ἠλλοτριῶσθαι τὸν λόγον.

5 τινὲς μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τὸ πανηγυρικὸν εἶδος ἀνάγουσι τῆι τῶν ἐγκωμίων ἀπατηθέντες μελέτηι. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν εἴη τούτου τοῦ εἴδους ὁ λόγος· οὐ γάρ, ἔνθα τοῖς ἐγκωμίοις χρησόμεθα, τὸν λόγον ἀνάγκη‹ι› τούτου τοῦ εἴδους προσαγορεύσομεν. μή που γε καὶ τὸν Περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου λόγον πανη-

1 πλείστου⸗ **A**
συμμορίαν **O** : σημασίαν, *sed add.* γρ. συμμορίαν *Dindorfii* **A**
2 ὡς **O** : ὥσπερ **L**
οὐ **O** : τοῦ **L**
ῥητορία **T**
5 κρείττον' *Lenz* : κρεῖττον **O** σιν
ἀποδείκνυσιν **A L** : ἀποδείκνυσι **O** : ἀποδεικνύει *Dindorfii* **A**
6 ἐνταῦθα **O** : ἐντεῦθεν **L**
καὶ *i.q. quoque, his quoque, non solum arti*
7 γενομένην **O** : ὀφειλομένην **L**
ἀπονέμων **O** : ἀπονέμων *et i. m.* γρ. ἀπονέμει **a** : ἀπονέμει **K**
post βοήθειαν *desin.* **L Q T**
καὶ - αὕτη *i. m. adscr. m. rec.* **Q** : *post* αὕτη *spat. reliquit vacuum, tum* Τὸ δὲ **a**
8 τῇ **O** : τὴν **R**
10-11 εἶναι τὸν λόγον (-ον *corr. ex* -ων **A**c) εἰδῶν **A K a** *Paris. 2952. 2953. Vat. 933* : εἰδῶν εἶναι τὸν λόγων **R**
11 τούτων ἀμφοτέρων **A R**, *i.e.* τοῦ πανηγυρικοῦ καὶ τοῦ δικανικοῦ : τούτων ἑτέρων **K** *Paris. 2952. 2953. Vat. 933* : καὶ τούτων **a**
12 ἀνάγκη⸗ **A**
τῶν λόγων ἠλλοτριῶσθαι *cum* **A** *suo Dind.*
15 ἀνάγκη *etiam* **A R**
τούτου τοῦ εἴδους **O** : τοῦ εἴδους τούτου *Dindorfii* **A**
16 προσαγορεύσομεν **A R** : προσαγορεύειν **K a** *Paris. 2952. 2953. Vat. 933*
τοῦ **O** : *om. Dindorfii* **A**

γυρικοῦ λέγειν ἐπιχειρήσωμεν εἴδους. ἄλλως τε τὸ κατασκευαζόμενον
ἀεὶ προδήλως, οὐ τὸ κατασκευάζον χαρακτηρίζει τὸν λόγον. καίτοι εἴ γε
σκοπήσομεν, τί τῶν ἐγκωμίων ὑπάρχει τὸ ἴδιον, εὑρήσομεν ἥκιστα
6 τὸν λόγον τῶι εἴδει συμβαίνοντα. ἔστι τοίνυν ἐγκώμιον ὁμολογουμένων
αὔξησις ἀγαθῶν· ὅπερ ἐνταῦθα ἀπάιδει τῆς προκειμένης παντελῶς
ὑποθέσεως· οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἤδη φανερῶν ὄντων ποιεῖται τὴν αὔξησιν, ἀλλὰ
πρὸς λύσιν ἐπάγει τῶν ἐκ Πλάτωνος εἶναι δοξάντων ἐγκλημάτων τὴν
τῶν ἐγκωμίων ἡμῖν ἐργασίαν ὁ ῥήτωρ. διὸ καὶ τὸν λόγον οὐκ ἐγκώμιον
εἶναι φαίημεν ἄν. οὐ γὰρ αὐθαιρέτως τοῦτο προθέμενος ἐπάγει τὸν
ἔπαινον, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἀνάγκηι τινὶ καὶ τῆι παρούσηι τῆς παραβολῆς
χρείαι τοῦτο πεποίηκεν. τότε γὰρ εἶναι φαίης <ἂν> ἐγκώμιον, ὅτε προη-
γουμένως, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀνάγκηι τινὶ ποιεῖταί τις τὸν ἔπαινον.
7 οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τῶι δικανικῶι κοινωνίαν ἔχει ὁ λόγος· οὐδὲ γὰρ τούτου
φυλάττει τὸ ἴδιον. ἴδιον γὰρ τούτου πᾶν τὸ ἐν κατηγορίαι καὶ ἀπολογίαι.
ἐνταῦθα δὲ τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ὁ Πλάτων οὐκ ἐγκλήματα μᾶλλον ἐπήνεγκεν.
κολακεία δὲ ἄρα μισεῖται μέν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἤδη κολάζεται. ἄλλως τε καὶ
τρισὶ τούτοις ὁ δικανικὸς χαρακτηρίζεται λόγος, ἐκ τόπου, ἐκ προσώπου,
435 D. ἐκ τέλους. εἰ τοίνυν μὴ / τόπος αὐτῶι τὸ δικαστήριον μηδὲ πρόσωπον τὸ
δικάζον ὑπόκειται, τέλος δὲ οὐκ ἔχει τοὐπιτίμιον, ὅπερ εἰκός, οὐδὲ
τούτου <ἂν> εἴη τοῦ εἴδους ὁ λόγος.
8 λείπεται τοίνυν εἶναι τὸ εἶδος ἀντίρρησιν, ὥς φησι Θέων ὁ τεχνογράφος.
ὃ τῶν μὲν προγυμνασμάτων κεχώρισται, μερικὸν δὲ ῥητορικῆς εἶδος

4 τῶ εἴδει O : τῶ εἴδει τούτω *Dindorfii* A
5 δεῖ A R, ἀπάιδει A^c
8 *post* λόγον *lac. 10-11 litt., tum* οὐκ *Paris. 2953. Vat. 933*
9 εἶναι A R : *om.* K a *Paris. 2952. 2953. Vat. 933*
11 πεποίηκεν A : πεποίηκε O
<ἂν> *Lenz* : *om.* O : *post* φαίης *vid. inser. γ' m. rec.* a
12 τινὶ O : *om. Paris. 2952*
15 οὐκ O : οὐ φύσει (φύσει *i. ras. non artiore m. rec.*) K, *cf. H1 p. 160, 8*
μᾶλλον A R : μόνον a *Vat. 933* : *om.* K; *subaudiendum est* ὅσον κολακείαν *ex verbis quae sequuntur*
ἐπήνεγκεν A R : ἐπήνεγκε O : ἐπήνεγκεν ἀλλὰ κολακείαν: ν *add. m. rec. et* ἀλλὰ κολακείαν *sup. lin. add. m. rec.* K
18 εἰ τοίνυν μὴ τόπος αὐτῶ O : εἰ μὴ τόπος τοίνυν αὐτῶ *Dindorfii* A
20 ἂν *om.* O : *post* τούτου *vid. inser. γ' m. rec.* a, *cf. 11*; *post* εἴδους *hab.* ἂν *si Dind. fides habenda est Dindorfii* A
21 εἶναι τὸ εἶδος O : τὸ εἶδος εἶναι *Dindorfii* A
θέων ὁ τεχνογράφος O : ὁ τεχνογράφος θέων *Vat. 933*

τετύχηκεν. καὶ τῶν μὲν γενικωτάτων εἰδῶν οὐκ ἔστι, τέλειόν γε μὴν εἶδος καθέστηκεν, εἰ καὶ μέρος ὑπάρχει γενόμενον.

9 διαφέρειν δέ φασι τὴν ἀντίρρησιν τῆς ἀντιγραφῆς τῶι τὴν μὲν ἀντίρρησιν ἐπὶ ζώντων ποιεῖσθαι τοὺς λόγους, τὴν δὲ ἀντιγραφὴν ἐπὶ μόνων τῶν οὐ μετεχόντων τοῦ βίου. πάλιν δὲ λέγουσιν ἕτεροι τὸ αὐτὸ τυγχάνειν ἐν διαφόροις ὀνόμασιν. φασὶ δὲ μικτὸν εἶναι τὸν λόγον ἐκ πανηγυρικοῦ καὶ δικανικοῦ συγκείμενον εἴδους· καὶ πανηγυρικοῦ μὲν τῶι διεξιέναι τὰ κατορθώματα, δικανικοῦ δὲ τῶι τὴν ἐκ τῶν ἀντιθέσεων ἀφαιρεῖσθαι βλάβην ταῖς λύσεσιν.

1 τετύχηκεν **A R** : τετύχηκε **v** : ἔσχε **K a** *Paris. 2952. 2953. Vat. 933*
v
3 διαφέρει **a**
τῆς γραφῆς **a**
6 ὀνόμασιν **A** : ὀνόμασι **O**
μικτὸν εἶναι τὸν λόγον **A R** : τὸν λόγον μικτὸν εἶναι **K a** *Paris. 2952 2953. Vat. 933*
8 ἐκ τῶν *deest apud Dind.*
ἀφαιρεῖσθαι: αι *i. ras. corr.* **v**

INDICES

I. NAMES

Arethas: 6. 20 f. 24. 26
Athanasius: 12 ff. 16. 25. 56. 99
John of Sicily: 15. 56
Sopater: 12 f. 14 f. 16. 44. 59. 61
Theon: 7 f. 14 f.

II. PROLEGOMENA

111, 13-15: 54 f.
112, 2 ff.: 47. 49
112, 3 f.: 48
112, 8 f.: 49
113, 6 ff.: 48. 58 f.
113, 9: 49
113, 11: 49
115, 3 ff.: 50
115, 7 f.: 61
115, 10: 50
116, 2 f.: 62
116, 3: 47
117, 1: 51
117, 10: 63. 63[1]
117, 13 f.: 64
118, 12 ff.: 69 ff. 78 f.
122, 1: 73[1]
123, 11: 74[2]
123, 12: 75[1]
124, 10 ff.: 77[2]
128, 15: 81[3]
130, 13: 81 f.[3]
136, 5 f.: 81 f.[3] 87
137, 1 ff.: 86[2]
138, 4 f.: 81 f.[3]
138, 6 f.: 81 f.[3]
139, 3: 81 f.[3]
140, 11 f.: 74[1]
141, 3: 45. 81 f.[3]
141, 5: 91
142, 14-16: 107
142, 18: 81 f.[3]
144, 7: 94
144, 12: 95[1]
148, 6: 97[3]
149, 12 f.: 30
150, 12: 18[2]
151, 1: 16
153, 1: 101 f.
153, 2: 103
153, 3 f.: 103

III. THE HYPOTHESEIS I AND II

157, 2-4 ~ 169, 2-4: 19 f.
157, 3: 32
157, 4: 22
157, 5 ~ 169, 6: 36
157, 5 f. ~ 169, 5 f.: 22
157, 5 f.: 32
157, 7 f.: 22
157, 9 f.: 37
157, 14 ~ 169, 15 f.: 23
158, 1: 23
158, 2: 32
158, 13: 28
158, 14-16: 28
158, 16: 30
159, 2 f.: 32
159, 7 ff.: 75
159, 10: 28
159, 10-11: 28
159, 12 f.: 28
160, 1 f.: 29

160, 3: 33
160, 6 f. ~ 171, 13 f.: 36
160, 9: 33
160, 11 f.: 36
161, 1 f.: 33
161, 3: 30
161, 3 ff.: 13 f.
161, 4 f.: 28
161, 5: 8
161, 7 f.: 28
161, 8 f.: 28
161, 10 f.: 28. 30
161, 10 ff.: 7 f.
161, 11 f.: 27
161, 12: 28
162, 1: 9. 29
162, 1 f.: 29
162, 2 ff.: 33 f.
162, 3-6: 15
162, 4 f.: 30
162, 6: 30
162, 7 ff.: 10
162, 10 f.: 28
163, 4 f.: 29
163, 4 ff.: 34
163, 5 f.: 31
163, 6: 32
163, 7 f.: 27
163, 9 f.: 31
164, 2 ff.: 33 f.
164, 5 ff.: 26 f.
165, 2: 33
165, 11 ff.: 10
166, 2 f.: 11
169, 2-4: 19 f.
169, 3: 37
169, 7: 37
169, 7 f.: 22
169, 9: 37
170, 7: 37 f.
171, 13 ~ 160, 6: 36
171, 16: 36
171, 21 f.: 7. 9
172, 3: 10
172, 6-9: 11

IV. SCHOLIA

III 9, 17 ff. Dindorf: 61
44, 23: 69
213, 36-214, 6: 5[1]
240, 28: 61
283, 35-284, 6: 75
286, 9: 73 ff. 76
432, 31 ff.: 57[3]
439, 26: 17[1]
456, 23: 12 f.
465, 17 ff.: 94[2]

V. OTHER AUTHORS

Harpocration s. ἀναγκαῖον (p. 17, 2 Bekker): 61[1]
Hermogenes π. στάσ.
p. 37, 1 ff. Rabe: 98[3]
38, 3: 97
39, 8 ff.: 97[1]
Libanius Vit. Dem. 1: 81[2]
7: 65
Lucian Catapl. 26: 94[3]
Nero 10: 51[1]
Marcellinus Vit. Thuc. 31 ff.: 65. 67
Philostratus Vit. Soph. II 55 Kayser: 60
86, 23: 55
86, 26 f.: 57
87, 10: 56
87, 20 ff.: 59
89, 30 f.: 64
Plato Prolegomena VII p. 201 Hermann: 66
Sopater Hermog. Techn. V 91, 24 Walz: 97
Sophocles Vit. 14 ff.: 65 f.
Suda s. Ἀριστείδης: 55
Syrian Hermog. π. στάσ. IV 240, 22 Walz: 96
245, 23: 95

VI. INDEX NOMINUM: PROLEGOMENA ET HYPOTHESEIS I. II

Ἀδριανοί: 111, 14
Ἀδριανὸς ὁ σοφιστής: 113, 10
Ἀδριανούπολις: -εως 111, 14
Ἀθῆναι: -αις 113, 10 ἐν -αις 111, 6. 112, 6 ἐν ταῖς -αις 113, 12 sq. Ἀθήνησι 134, 11. 138, 12. 151, 2. [155, 12.] -ιν 161, 4
Ἀθηναῖοι: -ων 114, 5. 121, 4. 6. 16. 123, 8. 124, 2. 127, 3 -οις 123, 13 -ους 129, 14. 136, 4. 138, 9. 144, 12. 16. 154, 4
Αἰγύπτιοι: -οις 124, 7
Αἰσχίνης: 111, 4 -ου 160, 1
Ἀλέξανδρος: -ε 127, 6
Ἀλκμέων: 117, 1
Ἀμαζόνες: -ων 115, 6 sq.
Ἀνδροτίων: -νος 158, 11
Ἀντωνῖνος (imperator): 112, 4 -ου 113, 2. 4. 5 -ωι 113, 1 -ον 112, 3
Ἀριστείδης (ὁ δίκαιος): -ην 130, 12
Ἀριστείδης: 111, 8. 112, 7. 113, 3. 4. 12. 117, 6. 121, 12. 122, 4. 123, 8. 127, 2. 129, 7. 138, 14. 139, 6. 140, 14. 142, 1. 9. 143, 10. 13. 144, 3. 145, 7. 150, 11. 13. 154, 5. 158, 1. 159, 9. 169, 16 -ου 117, 9. 118, 1. 121, 2. 153, 1 -ην 111, 10. 130, 15 Ἱεροὶ λόγοι (= XLVII-LII Keil) 112, 11 sq. Λόγος πρὸς τὸν Ἀντωνῖνον (= XIX Keil) 112, 3 sqq. Παναθηναϊκός 114, 4. 16. 121, 2. 142, 10 -ον λόγον 154, 16 ἄλλον -όν 114, 12 Ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς 158, 1. 8 Ὑπὲρ τῶν δ' 149, 3. II 156, 3 sq. Dind.: 158, 7 sq.; II 159, 20 *et* 160, 7 Dind.: 111, 11
Ἀριστείδης (ἄλλος νεώτερος): -ου 117, 12
Ἀριστοτέλης (Κατηγορίαι): 143, 12
Ἀρίστων (*Platonis pater*): -νος 157, 2. 169, 2
Ἀσία: -ας 118, 13 -αι 111, 6
Ἀσιανός: -ῶν ἀνδρῶν 112, 5
Ἀσιάς: -άδος 155, 2
Ἀσκληπιός: -οῦ 112, 9 sq. 13
Βούσιρις: 124, 6 -ιδος 124, 4 -ιδι 142, 9
Γαληνός: -όν 115, 10
Γοργίας: 138, 10 -ου 132, 2 -αι 127, 2. 131, 4 -αν 138, 6. 157, 5. 169, 6 -α 131, 6
Δελφοί: ἐν -οῖς 115, 12 εἰς -ούς 116, 5
Δημοσθένης: 111, 4. 142, 5. 159, 11 -ους 124, 12. 155, 5 -ει 119, 3 -ην 118, 4. 8. 153, 4. 8 ὁ ῥήτωρ 158, 10. 159, 10 Κατὰ Ἀνδροτίωνος 158, 11 Περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου 159, 2. 10. 170, 16 Πρὸς Λεπτίνην 158, 11. 159, 3
Δημοσθενικός: -όν 123, 6 -ῶς 144,3
Ἑλληνικαί: 115, 8
Ἐριχθόνιος: -ου 115, 6
Εὐδαίμων (Aristidis pater): -ονα 111, 13
Ἔφεσος: ἐν -ωι 112, 5
Ἡρόδοτος 115, 3. 5 -ου 115, 4. 7 -ον 118, 8. 153, 8
Ἡρώδης 111, 7 -ου 114, 4. 11. 13 sq.
Θεμιστοκλῆς: 111, 3 -έους 136, 7. 142, 3 -έα 134, 13. 138, 7. 140, 2. 157, 11. 169, 11
Θεόπομπος: 115, 5 -ου 115, 9
Θέων ἐν τοῖς Προγυμνάσμασιν: 161, 12 ὁ τεχνογράφος 171, 21
Θουκυδίδης: -ου 115, 4. 8 -ηι 142, 6 -ην 118, 8. 153, 8
Ἰσοκράτης: 111, 4. 122, 1. 142, 9 -ους 124, 3. 140, 7 -ην 118, 7 sq. 121, 11. 153, 7 sq. Παναθηναϊκός 121, 12
Καλλικλῆς: 135, 7. 8. 137, 3. 138, 12 -έους 135, 10. 136 3. 138, 6
Κατηγορίαι *v. sub* Ἀριστοτέλης
Κελέος: -οῦ 115, 6
Κίμων: -ος 136, 5 -α 134, 14. 138, 7. 140, 3. 157, 11. 169, 12
Λεπτίνης: -ην 158, 11
Λογγῖνος: 118, 2. 153, 2
Μαραθών: -νι 136, 7
Μάρκος: 114, 7 -ου 113, 10 -ωι 113, 2. 12

Μηλιεῖς: -έων 122, 5. 123, 13
Μιλτιάδης: -ου 142, 3 -ην 134, 14. 136, 7. 138, 7. 140, 3. 157, 11. 169, 11
Νέρων: 116, 3, 6. 10. 11. 117, 1
Ξενοφῶν: 115, 5 -τος 115, 8
Ξέρξης: *cf.* 118, 13
Ὀλύμπιος (Περικλῆς): -ον 147, 8
Ὁμηρικός: -όν τόπον 142, 17
Ὀρέστης: 117, 1
Παναθήναια: -οις 114, 16
Παναθηναϊκός *v. sub* Ἀριστείδης *et* Ἰσοκράτης
Πελοποννησιακά: 115, 8
Πέργαμον: ἐν -ωι 112, 9
Περικλῆς: 111, 3 -έους 136, 3. 144, 11 -εῖ 160, 9 -έα 134, 14. 138, 7. 140, 2. 147, 8. 157, 11. 169, 12; *cf.* Ὀλύμπιος
Περσικά: 115, 7
Πλάτων: 127, 5. 150, 7. 13. 157, 2. 11. 160, 8. 162, 7. 171, 15 -νος 127, 2. 6. 129, 7. 131, 3. 139, 4. 142, 2. 144, 1. 4. 13. 154, 1. 171, 7 -νι 137, 6. 139, 8. 145, 1 -να 118, 9. 148, 15. 153, 9
Πολέμων: 111, 7 -νι 112, 1
Ποσειδῶν: -νος 124, 8
Πυθία: 116, 7. 13
Πῶλος: 134, 4 -ον 138, 6
Ῥωμαῖοι: -ων 112, 4
Σκιωναῖοι: -ων 124, 1
Σκιώνη: -ης 122, 5
Σμυρναῖος: -ον 111, 15
Σμύνρα: ἐν -ηι 113, 2
Σωκράτης: 131, 3. 132, 3. 134, 4. 7. 10 sq. 14. 135, 9. 10. 138, 4. 8 -ει 138, 11
Σώπατρος: 151, 1. [155, 11]
Τριπτόλεμος: -ου 115, 6
Τυφών: -νος 117, 4
Τύχη: 111, 6
Φιλιππικαί: 115, 9
Φωκεῖς: -έων 116, 2

VII. INDEX RHETORICUS

ἀγαθά *v. sub* ἀμφίδοξος ἔνδοξος ὁμολογούμενα
ἄγραφος (*without manuscript*): 111, 2
ἀγών: 141, 8. 143, 1. 153, 11. 154, 14. 165, 13 sqq.
ἀγωνίζεσθαι: 154, 10. 12
ἀγωνιστικός: 142, 14 sqq. 143, 3 sq. -ὴν φύσιν 154, 17 -ὸν εἶδος 155, 8 -ῶν σχημάτων εὑρετής 118, 12. 154, 17 sq.
ἀκρίβεια: 119, 4
ἀμφίδοξος: -α ἀγαθά 122, 12 sqq. -α τῶν ἐγκωμίων 142, 11
ἀμφισβήτησις: 161, 9
ἀνασκευή: 149, 6. 7. 10. 11. 161, 5
ἀνθορίζεσθαι: 140, 4
ἀντέγκλημα: 145, 13
ἀντιγραφή: 172, 3 sq.
ἀντίθεσις: 121, 18. 122, 5. 123, 7. 124, 1. 3. 141, 7. 9. 142, 8. 12. 172, 8 ἀ. στοχαστική 124, 5
ἀντιθετικός: 145, 4. 11
ἀντίρρησις: 149, 7. 162, 1. 171, 21. 172, 3 sq.
ἀντίστασις: 145, 12
ἀπολογία: 141, 7. 158, 4 sq. 160, 8. 166, 1. 170, 4. 171, 14
ἀρχαῖος: 155, 1
ἀσύστατος: 149, 3. 5
ἀσφαλής: 155, 1
ἀσχημονεῖν: 114, 14
αὔξησις: 121, 8. 159, 8. 171, 5 sq.
αὐξητικός: 124, 12. 159, 7
αὐτοσχεδιάζειν: 113, 11
βαθύς: 119, 2. 155, 4
βασιλικός: 162, 5
βιάζεσθαι: 140, 15
βίαιος: 118, 4. 153, 4. 11
γενικώτατα εἴδη: 172, 1
γόνιμος: 118, 3. 119, 6. 153. 3. 155, 7
γραφή: 146, 11
δεκὰς τῶν ῥητόρων: 111, 5
δευτερολογία: 158, 5 sq. 10
δημοσθενίζειν: 118, 10. 153, 10
διαβολή: 122, 6. 123, 4. 13. 139, 2. 143, 7. [165, 10]. 166, 7
διαίρεσις: 149, 8 sq., 158, 12. 159, 4

διαλαμβάνειν: 154, 2
διαλύειν: 124, 1
διασκευή: 138, 14
δικανικός: 141, 5 sqq. 142, 1 sqq. 171, 13 -ὸς λόγος 171, 17 -ὴ ὑπόθεσις 143, 1 sqq. -ὸν εἶδος 143, 7. 144, 6. 160, 6 sqq. 161, 1. 172, 7
δογματίζειν: 140, 9
δοκιμάζειν: 144, 5
ἔγγραφος (*with manuscript*): 111, 4
ἔγκλημα: 122, 6. 144, 10. 13. 145, 2 sqq. 146, 2 sqq. 10. 13 sq. 159, 9. 160, 7 sqq. 11. 166, 1 sqq. 171, 7. 15
ἐγκωμιαστικός: 142, 9. 143, 3. 9. 158, 16 sq. -ὴ ἰδέα 162, 6 -ὸν εἶδος 159, 1 sq.
ἐγκώμιον: 121, 6. 7. 10 sq. 16. 122, 4. 124, 4. 13. 141. 2. 142, 11. 13. 154, 11. 14. 158, 17. 159, 1 sqq. 160, 5. 165, 12. 166, 1 sqq. 170, 13 sqq. 171, 3 sq. 8 bis. 11
ἐδάφια: 129, 4. 155, 13
εἶδος: 141, 2. 143, 5. 158, 13. 14. 159, 5. 161, 3. 4. 170, 8 sq. 11. 14 sq. 171, 4. 20. 21. 172, 2 ἀγωνιστικὸν εἶδος 155, 8 γενικώτατα εἴδη 172, 1 δικανικὸν εἶδος 141, 9. 143, 7. 144, 6. 160, 6 sqq. 161, 1. 172, 7 sq. ἐγκωμιαστικὸν εἶδος 159 1 sq. μερικὸν εἶδος ῥητορικῆς 162, 2. 4. 171, 22 πανηγυρικὸν εἶδος 114, 17. 148, 2. 170, 13. 16 sq. 172, 6 sq. τὰ τρία εἴδη τῆς ῥητορικῆς 150, 2
ἐκπλήττειν: 113, 11. 114, 2
ἐλλόγιμος: 111, 10
ἐμμεθόδως: 139, 3
ἔνδοξος: 124, 5. 142, 12 sqq. -α ἀγαθά 122, 12 sq.
ἐνθύμημα: 118, 10
ἐνθυμηματικός: 118, 3. 153, 4. 10 sq.
ἐξήγησις: 131, 2. 139, 2
ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι: 155, 7
ἐπιθαλάμιος: 162, 5
ἐπιστήμη (*scholae doctrina*): 111, 7
ἐπιτάφιος: 162, 5
ἐπιχείρημα: 143, 4. 153, 10. 155, 9
εὐήθης: 119, 1
εὑρετής *v.* σχῆμα
ἐφοδεύειν: 131, 3
ἔφοδος: 138, 2
θέσις (*cum geographice usurpatum est, non attuli*): 149, 4 -ει τῆς ἀντιθέσεως 124, 3 κατὰ θέσιν (*oppos.* κατὰ φύσιν) 145, 11. 146, 4
θεώρημα: 144, 2
ἰδέα ἐγκωμιαστική: 162, 6
καινοπρεπής: 154, 15
καινός: -ῶν σχημάτων εὑρετής 154, 15
καταγόρευσις: 143, 11
κατασκευάζειν: 159, 5. 171, 1 sq.
κατασκευή: 144, 15. 158, 7
κατηγορία: 122, 5. 123, 4. 142, 2 sq. 143, 10 sqq. 144, 3. 146, 3. 160, 4. 162, 8. 171, 14 κατηγορία ἤτοι διαβολή (*Platonis Gorgias*) 157, 14, *cf.* 165, 9 sq. 169, 9. 15
κενός: 118, 13
κινεῖν: 119, 5. 155, 6
κοῦφος: 118, 13. 155, 2
κρείττων χρημάτων: 111, 11
κύριος: 155, 1
κυρίως: 142, 18
κῦρος: 147, 10
λέξις: 119, 1. 3. 125, 2. 144, 2. 4. 155, 1. 3. 4
λύειν: 122, 9. 124, 7; *cf.* διαλύειν
λύσις: 122, 8. 10. 123, 5. 127, 4. 139, 3. 159, 8. 160, 4. 166, 4. 171, 7. 172, 9
μάχιμος: 142, 15 sqq. 143, 4 sqq. 153, 12
μελέτη: 170, 14
μερικὸν εἶδος ῥητορικῆς: 162, 2. 4. 171, 22
μέσα: <123, 12>, *cf.* 124, 1
μετάστασις: 144, 10. 145, 2-9 146, 13
μεταφράζειν: 142, 18
μεταχείρισις: 121, 13. 123, 3. 140, 8. 141, 1
νοεῖν: 119, 3
νόημα: 166, 3
νοῦς: 119, 5
οἰκονομεῖσθαι: 139, 6

οἰκονομία: 153, 12. 154, 1
ὁμολογούμενα ἀγαθά: 122, 12. 123, 2 sq. 9 sq. 159, 6 sqq. 171, 4 sq.
ὁρίζεσθαι: 113, 11. 131, 14. 132, 4. 142, 1. 148, 11. 150, 2
ὅρος: 131, 4. 139, 3. 9. 148, 7. 16
πανηγυρικός: 149, 14 -ἡ ὑπόθεσις 150, 15 -αἱ ὑποθέσεις 148, 3 τὸ -ὸν εἶδος 114, 17. 148, 2. 170, 13. 16 sq. 172, 6 sq. τὸ τῶν -ῶν εἶδος 124, 10 sq.
παραίνεσις: 140, 8
παραίτησις: 158, 9
παρασκευή: 162, 10 sqq. 164, 3. 4. 165, 8
περιουσία: 170, 5
περίστασις: 146, 2 sq. 147, 1. 161, 9
περιττός: 153, 3
πιθανός: 127, 3. 129, 5. 153, 13 -ῶς 140, 5
πιστοῦσθαι: 140, 7
ποιότης: 146, 7 sq. 154, 7. 10
πολιτικός[1]: 127, 8 sq. 132, 4. 140, 2 sqq. 143, 6. 145, 5 sqq. 147, 5 sqq. 148, 7 sqq. 150, 5 sqq. 154, 2 sqq.
πρᾶγμα: 165, 11 sqq.
πραγματικός: -ἡ στάσις 148, 1 ὑπόθεσις 147, 4-13. 148, 4
προγύμνασμα: 149, 9. 12. 161, 5 sqq. 162, 2. 171, 22; *v. sub* Θέων
πρόσχημα: 165, 8
πρόσωπον: 165, 11 sqq.
πρότασις: 144, 14
πυκνότης: 118, 10. 153, 10
ῥητορεία: 153, 7
σαφής: 155, 2 -ές 125, 2
σεμνός: σεμνοτάτην φράσιν 124, 11
στάσις: 144, 5. 7. 145, 3. 146, 4. 147, 3. 13. 148, 5. 7 στάσις πραγματική 148, 1
στοχαστικός: 124, 5. -ῶς 124, 7
συγγνώμη: 146, 1
σύγγραμμα: 121, 10
συλλογισμός: 139, 3. 141, 1
συμβουλευτικός: 158, 15
συμβουλή: 170, 9
σύστασις: 154, 6
σχῆμα: σχῆμα τοῦ λόγου 158, 5 -των ἀγωνιστικῶν εὑρετής 118, 12. 154, 17 sq. καινῶν -των εὑρετής 154, 15 σχῆμα χιαστόν 154, 16
σώφρων: 111, 11
τάξις: 153, 13
τομή: 149, 9
τροπικός: 119, 1. 155, 2
ὕλη: 118, 9. 121, 13. 139, 6. 143, 5. 146, 4. 149, 5. 153, 9
ὑπόθεσις: 121, 3. 14. 123, 6. 127, 8. 138, 4. 142, 8. 143, 1. 3. 9. 144, 7. 10. 149, 3. 12. 153, 6. 154, 14. 158, 13. 160, 3. 161, 6 sqq. 166, 5 πανηγυρικὴ ὑπόθεσις 150, 15 πανηγυρικαὶ ὑποθέσεις 148, 3 ὑπόθεσις πραγματική 147, 4-13 χαίρων καιναῖς ὑποθέσεσιν 118, 6
ὑπόκενος: 155, 2
φιλόνικος: 153, 11
φιλότιμος: 118, 6. 124, 10. 153, 6
φοραὶ ῥητόρων: 111, 2 sqq.
φράσις: 124, 11
φύσις: 119, 6. 124, 13. 143, 5 sqq. 155, 7. 160, 8 sqq. ἀγωνιστικὴ φύσις 154, 17 φύσις ἐν τοῖς λόγοις 118, 1. 153, 1 φύσις μεταστάσεως 145, 9 κατὰ φύσιν (*oppos.* κατὰ θέσιν) 145, 11. 146, 2 sq. 10
χαρακτήρ: 118, 1. 143, 8. 153, 1. 12
χιαστὸν σχῆμα: 154, 16
χρεία: 143, 3. 155, 9 χρεία τῆς παραβολῆς 171, 10 sq.

[1]) Magni momenti est adiectivum ἀπροσδεής 128, 3, quod in indice rhetorico locum non habet.